

A
REVIEW
OF AN
ESSAY
UPON

Gospel and Legal Preaching.

In several LETTERS to a FRIEND:

Gal. I. 7 &c.--- *There be some that trouble you,
and would pervert the Gospel of Christ.*

8 *But though WE, or an ANGEL from
Heaven, preach any OTHER GOSPEL
unto you, than that which we have preach-
ed unto you, let him be ACCURSED. &c.*

EDINBURGH:

Printed, and are to be sold by Mr. J^r. Mc-
Euen, and other Book-sellers in Edin-
burgh and Glasg^w. MDCCXXIII.
Price Stitched 8. d.



(A)

REVIEW

OF

AN ESSAY,

UPON

GOSPEL and LEGAL

PREACHING,

In several *Letters*, to a *Friend*.

LETTER I

S I R,

IN Compliance with your Desire, I have at length, yeilded to Snatch some Hours, now and then, from other Affairs wherein I am Necessarily ingaged, to take SOME REVIEW of *An Essay on Gospel, and gal Preaching*, and shall with all impartial freedom, Communicate to you my Thoughts thereupon.

If the *Anonymous Author*, be the Man, whom I have heard nam'd, by some who pretend to know it, He is, indeed, a SAGACIOUS WRITER, and hath brought forth a very *Accurate Exposure*, Writ in a neat Stile, and in a Manner abundantly *Exact*, tho' Artfully *Conceal'd*, and PRUDENTLY contriv'd to inculcate the Impressions design'd to be made upon the Minds

A

of

of the *Readers*. Nor can I Refuse, but that there are in it several excellent Truths, very well illustrated, and seasonable Dutys Judiciously explained, and Pathetically urged.

When I observed This, I was heartily grieved That such a *Polite Performance*, should have contained any Thing in it, which did, either directly, or indirectly, Border upon CALUMNY or ERROR. I was Sorry to find *some Opinions* palmed upon *some Authors*, and such Constructions put upon, and Conclusions drawn from their Words (grossly perverted) as, I am persuaded, are most disagreeable to their real Sentiments; and, which, their Words (duely considered) will not admit of. That The ERRORS some are espoused, and warmly defended, is, indeed, very Grievous to me; but that which most affected me is, the Insinuation which this Author makes, as if some of these Erroneous Tenets, were generally received by the Ministers of this Church. I hope it is otherwise; but be that as it will; *This Piece*, is much Applauded, Recommended, and Countenanced by a great many Ministers, both in *Town* and *Country*. However, Charity obliges me to Think, That The professed Design of it, Some Excellent Things contained in it, A Superficial Perusal whereof the Errors therein have not been Carefully noticed, The smoothness of the Stile, The captivating Method of *Harangue*, and, A Regard to the *Author* in those who know him, and to the *Recommenders*, in others, hath occasioned so much Interrainment of this Book; rather than a fixed Agreement with *Him*, in those of his Sentiments that are contrary to Sound Doctrine. Indeed, if what is much talked be true, There is some Ground to fear the *spreading Contagion*



the *Errors* of This, otherwise, *handsom Performance*; viz. That it hath been long on the File, and hath passed through the Hands of some *Eminent Paper-drawers, Leading Men, and Able Criticks*: Now, if so, what are these **ORACLES**, and **ORNAMENTS** of our *Church* not able to Contrive and Accomplish, even in an **ASSEMBLY IT SELF**, where their *Light Shines* like the *Sun*, and Darkens the *Numerous* and distant *Stars*? If these have been Ingaged in setting forth this *Performance* to the World with all the *Embellishments* of a *Quaint Wit*, and a *Rhetorical Stile*; Sure, they will support it, to the *utmost* of their *Power*; and who among us can say, *how GREAT*, that may be, in case **PRUDENCE** allow them to Exert it?

These Views of Matters, I must needs say, are discouraging, especially to so Mean a Pen; and I am Aware; That in an Age, wherein *Eminent Parts*, and *Policy*, are thought to be creeping down from the *Older*, to the *Younger* Sort of our **Aspiring CHURCH-MEN**, it can't miss to be accounted *highly Imprudent* to Attempt, as well as *utterly Impracticable* to succeed in any Attack upon such a well finished and generally carressed **PERFORMANCE**. But, considering, That it is not the *whole Composure*, that I pretend to Demolish, (for many Things in it, are both Substantial, and Beautiful) but only such Parts, as are, in themselves, either Irregular, Useless or Pernicious; I hope, I may, at least, make some Adventure, to cast up Trenches, to begin the Attack, and so, make way for more Able Hands to carry it on with Success. But, if this sincere Endeavour to throw in a Mite for maintaining the Cause of injured Truth, should not only prove **Unsuccessful**, but procure abundance of

A 2

Enemys

Enemys to me, and my Concerns; I Desire to adore Holy Providence, and to commit my self to him who judgeth Righteously, hoping, That, in due Time, TRUTH shall Triumph, and all it's Opposers be cloathed with Shame.

I shall not Detain you, (My good Friend) any longer in INTRODUCTION, only, I advise, you to have at Hand, The PREFACE to the *Second Part of The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, in the late *Edinburgh Edition*, and Mr. Gilbert on the *Guilt of Sin, Pardon of that Guilt, &c.* and the *Scope and Substance of the Marrow*, All which you will find needful, now and then, to have Recourse unto, for the more clear understanding of *This Essay*, and *My Review* thereof, to which I now Proceed.

THE *Author* hath a very Pleasant *Introduction* concerning the *Preaching of the Gospel*, both by the *First Eminent Ambassadors of Christ*, and others, who succeed them. If *These last*, did *Generally*, and *Unversally*, do, what our *Essayer* Suggests, P. 2d, viz. *Declare the whole Counsel of God*, I do Acknowledge it would be Unaccountable, nay, Impious, to Charge such Men, with LEGAL PREACHING: But, there being such a Thing in the World, as *Legal Preaching*, I can't think it a NICK-NAME to call Things as they are.

I am Heartily Sorry, that any who Professes Christianity, should be Indistinct in accounting for their Principles, and Sentiments in Matters of Religion, but, I am perswaded, we should Sin against the Generation of the Righteous, if we should disregard and slight well meaning Christians, who can't distinctly expresse themselves, as if they had no just Sentiments, no Taste and Relish, no Spiritual discerning of the

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 5

True Food of their Souls. As a living Babe hath the Sagacity to Discern its proper Food, and to Reject what is unsuitable, tho' it can't Describe the Nature of either of 'em ; So, Sincere, tho' weak Christians, can find the sweetness of a true *Gospel Sermon*, feel Power attending it, and be thereby excited both to the Exercise of Grace, and Practice of Holiness, and in like Manner can Discern the *Unsavoury Tang* of a *Legal-preachment*, tho', perhaps, if discoursing with such a *Learned Critick* as our *Essayer*, they should be taxed with having no more but a Dark, and confused Jumble of Incoherent Notions of these Things. I am very far from Encouraging Weak, and well-meaning Christians, in their Weakness : I think they should be deeply concerned to advance both in *Grace*, and *Knowledge* : But neither do I think, on the other Hand, that their Sense, especially of those Things, which do so very nearly Concern the maintaining of their Spiritual Life, (of which kind, I take the discerning of a *Legal* or *Gospel Sermon*, to be a very Remarkable Instance,) should be Superciliously slighted, because not accurately expressed. And I am mis-inform'd, if the Person with whom our *Essayer* communed, as he says P. 3, be not one *Eminently Godly*, and one whom, some, no less *Sagacious* than HE do esteem, as *A discerning Christian*.

But, the Conference with this Private Christian gave him only a more Remote Occasion of considering this Subject ; For, He tells us P. 3. That, what he read in a very long Preface to a Book, made him view it more closely.

One would think it would have been proper here, to have told us what Book and *Preface* he means, but this, he keeps the Reader in Suspence

pence about, in this Place ; Perhaps, upon this *Prudent Consideration*, lest any Curious Persons, should have thought fit to read that *Preface*, which was the *Occasion of this Essay*, before they proceeded further, which might have quite spoiled the Beauty of his Flourishing Harangue against that *Author* and *others*, as *Enemys to Morality* and worse than *Sober Heathens*. I am not to Run out in *Panegyricks* on that *Preface*, but I hope I may be allow'd to do it *Justice*, in affirming, that the *Author* hath stated what Concerns *Gospel-holiness*, according to *Truth*. And I am Confident every Discerning and Impartial Reader, will conclude, That the *Essayer* hath Egregiously injured it, both by an Industrious Concealing of the True *Scope, Tenor, & Strain* of it, and by Misconstructing some Expressions, and drawing Inferences from them, Contrary to the *Author's Sense*, or the plain *Scope* of his Words, (duely pondered in their Connection) and Quarreling others as *Errors*, which are, *Sound Gospel Truths*. But, I go on.

Page 4th. The *Essayer* proceeds, as he says, to Explain the *Terms*, viz. What is Meant by *Legal* and *Gospel Preaching*. And, he hath, indeed, told us some Things, which no Body that I know, denys to be *Legal Preaching*; But then, they are, at least for the most part, such Things, as hardly can be expected, any Person who owns the Name of Christ can be supposed to assert, or Inculcate; And so, THE PRUDENT MAN, in stating the Question, takes Care to do it in such a Manner, as to have no Enemy to Grapple with, if once his Way of stating the Matter be admitted as an exact and full Account thereof; For, (Briefly to Run over his Harangue on this Head.) Who, E. G. ever deny'd that it was
Legal

Legal Preaching, to Preach That perfect Obedience, the Condition of Life, P. 5. That Man can obey the Holy Law of God, without being regenerated, and Born of the Spirit; That we have sufficient Stock of our own to Live on, and don't need a Redeemer's Grace to Strengthen us to every good Word, and Work: P. 6. That we are to Adress God Immediatly and to expect blessings from his Hands, without the Interposition of a Mediator P. 7. That the Law is that which Justifys the Sinner, and Obedience to it bounds our Claim to Heaven; P. 8. That Qualifications in us and some Things done by us, are our Justifying Righteousness; That Faith and Repentance are our Righteousness before God; P. 9. That *Works* are to be joined with *Faith* in the Business of *Justification*; That the *Law*, and *Faith* are to be blended together, and made an Impure and Motely Mixture of, in a Sinners Justification. P. 10.

Now, Sir, I own all this is *Legal Preaching* indeed, and our *Author* Lays down very solid *Premises* from whence he Infers these *Conclusions*; And here, I might Dismiss this Harangue from P. 4th, to P. 10th.

But, for clearing this matter, I would have it observed, That tho' in stating what *Legal Preaching* is, he tells us several Things, which indeed are SO; yet he takes no notice of such *Criminal Omissions* of those Things that are truly necessary unto the Illustrating and Pressing Holyness, in a *Gospel Way*; and, which Omissions may Justify the Denomination of *Legal Preaching*, tho' the Preacher do not Directly say, *That perfect Obedience is the Condition of Life; That Man can Obey the Holy Law of God without being Regenerated, &c.* If some Ingredients absolutely necessary

cessary unto a PRESCRIBED POTION, be left out by the Apothecary, to whom the care of making it up is committed; May we not say, It is not the *Potion Prescribed*, Tho' all the rest do also belong to the *Prescription*, and tho' nothing Contrary to it be put in. The *Application* is Easy. Tho' a Man, in his Preaching Morality should say nothing that is, Directly, Heterodox; Yet if he should omit these Doctrines that are necessary Ingredients to make his Sermon a truly Evangelical Discourse, I will not say he is Nick-named a *Legal Preacher*.

Now, Sir, I have heard some Judicious Christians say, That they have been, for a long Time under the Ministry of some Men, and that they Seldom heard them Insist on any other Subject, but the pressing of some Duty, and Declaiming against some Vice; Which they thought indeed, to be a Legal Strain of Preaching; Not because they said any Thing truly Contrary unto Truth, nor because either their Explications or Arguments, were, in themselves, wrong; But, because of their Habitual Neglect of Preaching either on the Root and Spring of Vice, *Our fall and the Corruption of our Nature*; Or the Source and Fountain of Holiness, *Union with Christ*, and many other necessary Gospel Doctrines.

Now, Sir, I do Acknowledge, Our *Essayer* hath laid down very Sound Principles, as Foundations from whence he Concludes, It would be *Legal Preaching*, to advance Doctrines Contrary thereunto: But he hath not considered that there may be some Preachers, who, Tho' they will not deny these Principles, nor renounce their Creed; Yet, do habitually omit to lay these Foundations, that are needfull to inculcate the Dutys of Religion in a Gospel Way, where-

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 9

by Sinners may be guarded against seeking Righteousness, even AS IT WERE by the Works of the Law. *Rom. IX. 32.*

What, tho' a Man should explain and inculcate The Dutys of *Religion* and *Morality* with great Zeal and Earnestness? What, tho' he should Declaim against Vice with strong and clear Arguments, and Multiply Directions unto Dutys, and against Sins of all Sorts? Yet, If he should habitually neglect to inculcate these Things which Our Author himself Premiseth, Page 4. and 5. Concerning the Law Written Originally on Man's Heart, as the Matter of that Covenant, God was pleased to make with him at his first Creation, Concerning Man's Primitive Innocency, and his being furnished with Abilities sufficient to do what ever was demanded of him, Concerning the Promise of Life to Adam, and, in him, to all his Posterity, upon Condition of Perfect and Personal Obedience, and concerning the Threatning of Death upon the smallest Transgression: If he should, habitually, neglect to Open up the Nature of the Surety-Righteousness, and of Faith in Christ as the Great Instrument of our Justification, and of Repentance as the Blessed Fruit of Faith, and it's Constant Concomitant; This Man, for such Habitual Omission, is not Nick-named a *Legal Preacher*, tho' he do not expressly Preach, *That Perfect Obedience is the Condition of Life, and, That Men can obey the Holy Law of God without being Regenerated, &c.* What if some do habitually omit to Preach in that Excellent Strain, which our Author expresseth, Page 5. and 6. E. G. That Man by the Fall is become Weak, and Wicked, That he neither can, nor will subject himself to the Law of God, That by the utmost Improve-

ment

ment of our Natural Abilities, and the Advantages we Enjoy by a Gospel Revelation, we can't recover our Nature out of its Ruins, That 'Tis as great a Miracle in the *Moral World* to raise a Sinner Dead in Trespasses, and Buried in the Grave of his Corruptions, to a Spiritual Life, as it is in the *Natural World* to raise a Man from Death to Natural Life. ----- And so on, as the Author, expresseth himself P. 5. &c. Shall a Man, who habitually omits these Things be accounted a True Gospel Preacher, tho' he Preach not Directly Contrary thereunto. ? I can't think he should.

I might Illustrate this Matter upon the other Instances of *Legal Preaching* adduced by our Author, whereunto he Premiseth Principles Sound and Orthodox, & Justly infers, That to Preach contrary to these is *Legal Preaching*. Did the Generality of Ministers habitually inculcate These Principles, and Preach in a Strain agreeable thereunto, we should never, perhaps, have heard so much about *Legal Preaching*. And, as I Rejoice to find such sound Principles here advanced by our *Essayer* in his stating the Question ; So, I wish heartily that the Effect of this Debate may be, to excite both him and others to Preach more and more in a Strain agreeable thereunto. And I am heartily glad to hear from some Judicious Christians, That, of late, several Ministers have Preach'd more in an Evangelical Strain than formerly they were wont to do. But indeed it will be otherways, if he, or they adhere Tenaciously unto some Things afterwards maintain'd in This Book, which are neither agreeable unto *These Principles*, he lays down in this Place, nor to truth it self, as shall, I hope, be made Evident in our Progress.

Tho'

Tho' I approve of the Truths which The Author Premiseth unto his Inferences of what is truly *Legal Preaching*; yet I cannot see, why they are brought in here; seeing none of the Authors, he pretends to Confute, do deny these Principles, or refuse, that it would be *Legal Preaching* to contradict them; nor do they Omit to own and confirm them expressly in their *Writings*, and these of 'em whom I know, in their *Sermons* too. Indeed, this would have been abundantly agreeable in his stating the Question, if he had likewise charged these with being *Legal Preachers*, who do *Habitually* omit, or but *very Perfunctoriously* Touch upon these Principles themselves, which are so necessary in *true Gospel Preaching*. But, This, our *Essayer* thinks fit to overlook.

You may observe, Sir, That, in the *Preface* to the *Second Part of the Marrow*, That Author, when speaking of the *Legal*, and *Gospel* way of Preaching **HOLINES** (for **THAT**, and not *Legal* and *Gospel* Preaching in its full *Extent*, is his Subject) does not, *SO much* state that Matter, upon the *Positive Preaching* of Doctrines, directly contrary unto *Gospel Principles*, AS, upon the *omitting* to insist on such Things as are needfull to inculcate *Holiness* in a *Gospel* way, and to guard People against mistaking, its true and proper Place, and Use; as you may see if you will be pleased to read from page 29th. where, He supposeth a Man may Preach Orthodoxly upon a great many good Subjects, and yet be a *Legal Preacher*, if he omit to inculcate these Things that are Necessary unto a *Gospel-strain* of Preaching. And you may further notice, that P. 30. he expressly says, 'Tis not the Subject it self, but the manner of treating it, that can justly Denominate

minate either a *Legal* or *Gospel* Sermon: And when he comes to speak of the manner of Preaching *Holiness* in particular, (which is his Subject) he states *Legal Preaching* thereof, upon OMISSIONS of what is absolutely needful unto a Gospel-strain.

Now, Sir, it appears somewhat strange to me, That our *Essayer* hath taken no notice of this way of stating of that Matter at all, no, not so much as to shew that it was not stated in a right manner. One would think he should have more narrowly considered a Discourse, which gave him the Occasion to View this Subject more closely. But, overlooking this, He puts off his Readers with what, indeed, would be *Legal Preaching*, but hath not made a full Enumeration of these Things, that make a Man a *Legal Preacher*. He hath taken no notice of the NEO-NOMIAN and BAXTERIAN way of Preaching, which, I fear, is like to Creep in amongst us, if not too much already, countenanced, and imitated. But I will not digress on this Subject, which deserves a Treatise by it self. I go on with our *Author*.

After, he hath in the Manner above-mentioned, told us *What Legal Preaching* is; He proceeds to mention *some Things*, Page 10th. Which, he says, are NOT LEGAL PREACHING, viz.
 “ The urging the Observance of God’s Law,
 “ and the Great Dutys of Morality, or Preach-
 “ ing Faith and Repentance, as necessary in Or-
 “ der to our Justification, or, The asserting, We
 “ are to Act FOR Life, as well as FROM
 “ Life, and, That Believers may be wrought
 “ upon by their *Hopes*, and *Fears*, or, Preaching
 “ the Necessity of Holyness, in Order to our
 “ Happiness, The Conditionality of the Co-
 “ venant

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 13

“ venant of Grace, and, That a Believer’s Sins
“ make him lyable to Death. Now, N. B.
The Author tells us “ He cannot look upon
“ this Way of Preaching to be LEGAL, till he
“ see better Reasons than have yet appeared.
N. B. One would think, That seeing he so
Peremptorily refuseth, the Preaching of THESE
THINGS, to be *Legal Preaching*, That he ap-
proves of every one of These Notions, and reckons,
That to inculcate them, would be Good, Sound
Gospel-Preaching ; And, yet, Sir, I cannot tell, in
all the World, how our Accurate Author hath
stumbled into the following Expressions at the
head of Page 11th. *viz.* [*I Look on some of
THESE NOTIONS as extremely Prejudicial to
Practical Piety*] ----- And more to this purpose
in that Page ----- Now Pray, *What Notions,*
Good Mr. *Essayer* ? The plain Construction of
your Words Import, That you refer to *These*
Notions mentioned immediatly before, *viz.* The
urging Obedience to God’s Law, ----- &c.
and which you said, but Just now, are *not Legal
Preaching*. Are these the Notions that are ex-
tremely Prejudicial to Practical Piety ? -----
Are these the Notions that Destroy Piety and
Exalt Men ? ----- I must say, Sir, That your
Expressions, as they ly, do Evidently carry this
Meaning ; and, for once, we are agreed ; For,
indeed, I think so too, That SOME of ’em, are
very Prejudicial to Practical Piety, --- But,
Sir, Tho’ you cannot extricate your self from
this plain and obvious Construction of your
Words, by which you have, at one Dash, given
up the whole Cause ; Yet, finding that you go
on to Justify every one of these Notions, in the
following Pages ; some whereof you say, in this
11th Page, are *Prejudicial to Practical Piety* ;

I shall not take you at this Advantage, to palm upon you this Sentiment, that you do, indeed, think any of 'em Prejudicial unto it ; Only, allow me to wonder a little, how you stumbled into such an unguarded Expression : Allow me to be yet more astonished how This escaped the Critical Eye of your *Revisers*, or *Associates*, The Skilful Paper-drawers, and Ornaments of this Church. But let the known Phrase *Quandoque Dormitat* HOMERUS, Apologize for you and Them ; and, for my part, I shall accept of *The Apology*, and shall not impute to you the Sentiments, which your Expressions, in themselves, do Evidently bear. Only allow me to Suggest to you, to be a little more modest in your Constructions of the unguarded Expressions that may Escape other Authors : And, if you will not allow a candid and Charitable Way of gathering Men's Sentiments from the General Strain and Scope of their Discourse, and the comparing of their Words less guarded, with other parts that speak more clearly ; One will be forced to give you TIT for TAT, to allow you no Quarter, and to urge strongly, that, in the Sentence, now quoted, you have given up the whole Cause, and that your Harangues in the following Pages, are nothing but a Heap of Contradictions to your self, while therein you defend Doctrines, some whereof, you have asserted, in this 11th Page, to be extremely prejudicial to Practical Piety, and which you Inveigh against with great warmth. But, tho' you have laid your self open, yet I shall not take up your Meaning according to this unguarded Expression, for I find by the Sequel, that I must understand you the quite contrary Way, viz. That you think these Notions, viz. The urging the Observance of God's

God's Law, &c. As enumerated Page 10th, are so far from being prejudicial to Practical Piety, that they are, the *True Evangelical Doctrines*, and, That your true meaning was, that the Preaching AGAINST the Observance of Gods Law, and the great Duys of Moralitie And so of the rest, are Doctrines prejudicial to Piety.

But now, to return from this Digression, and Application to our *Essayer*, let us follow him in his Considerations of these Things, which, he says, have the *Nick-name* of *Legal Preaching* put upon them.

From Page 11th to Page 20th. We have a Flourishing Harangue, to Excellent purpose, for the utter demolishing of a *Man of Straw*, which our Author hath reared up to Exercise his *Rhetorical Talent* upon. 'Tis, indeed pity that such a Talent should ly hid in a Napkin, but, *no less Pity* that it should be imployed, to so little purpose as to Fight against Shadows, to Swagger and push where there's no Enemy.

One who had never seen the *Preface* to the second Part of the *Marrow*, *Mr. Gilbert on Guilt of Sin and Pardon of that Guilt*, and *others*, which our *Essayer* pretends to Confute, would, upon reading this Harangue, be ready to Conclude, That These Authors deny the Law of Creation to be adopted into the Christian Institution, and to be made an Essential part of Religion, That they Maintain the Law not to be Holy, Just, and Good; That they refuse the Law to be an Eternal Rule of Righteousness, to all Rational Creatures, That they Reckon our Saviour himself a *Legal-preacher* for insisting on Purity of Heart, Poverty of Spirit, &c. And, The Apostles, no less so, for proceeding in the same Strain; That they

they lay out their warmth against Morality, and Brand it with the Name of HEATHENISM; That they are offended at that Morality that Christ hath Taught us by his Doctrine, exemplified to Perfection in his Life, and enforced so powerfully on us --- That they Oppose Morality because it is an Enemy to their Lusts: That they are at Enmity with it --- And are not for the Severity of the Christian Morals. --- But would have them struck out of the Scheme of their Religion, and some Airy Notions placed in their Room, that will give them the Hopes of Heaven when they come not the Length of an honest Heathen; That they greedily Embrace Schemes of Religion that Reconcile the Hopes of Heaven with a bad Life, --- That they distinguish away our *Morals*, and slacken our Obligation to the strict and Rigid Observance of all the several parts and Branches of our Duty --- One would think, that *These Authors*, whom our *Essayer* pretends to Confute, do Run down *Moral Dutys*, --- That they dash the *second Table* of the Law to peices, and raise the *First* upon the Ruines of the *Second* --- That, they, inyeigh against the Unquestionable Dutys of Morality, as *Filthy Heathenism*, --- That, they Exclaime against that Morality which shines with such a Lustre and Beauty in the Lives of the Primitive Christians. --- That, they are affraid That Moral Dutys should get too much Footing among us --- That they spend Invectives against Morality --- and, a great deal more to this purpose.

These, Sir, are the Things our *Essayer* Declaims against, to Excelent purpose. --- And I find no Fault at all in his Arguments, but, that they suppose an Enemy where there is none, and
That

that the whole Harangue implys *A continued flatterer* of these *Authors*, whom he pretends to Con-
 fute, who, do, no less *Plainly* and *Pathetically*
 press and inculcat *Holiness of Life*, and all the
 branches of *Morality* than this our *Rhetorical*
Essay or his *Associats*. And, because The *Preface*
 to the *Second* part of the *Marrow* is owned, by
 our *Author*, to have given him the *Occasion* to
 consider this Subject more closely, I hope, I may,
 without trespassing upon good *Manners*, say,
 that, by this *Harangue*, it appears that he hath
 either not read it at all, or that he hath, with a
 pernicious design, concealed, what is the very
 strain and Scope of it, *The Illustrating and incul-*
ating of a Holy Life, upon the most solid Grounds
and Foundations.

Pray, Good Mr. *Essay*, Let me with all
 sincerity, *Pose* your Conscience: Dare you say
 that *The Preface* Mantains these Sentiments
 against *Morality* and *Holiness of Life*, which
 you do, indeed, with abundance of Strength
 and *Rhetorical* Sprightliness, Reason against?
 ay, Sir, Dare you say, but that he urges
 holiness and decrys Vice, not in a *Transient Ex-*
pression only, but, as the *Scope* *Strain* and *Tenor*
 of the whole *Discourse*, both in the *Preface* and
Appendix? And, if so, how have you arrived at
 the Impudence to Charge him and others of a
 the *Strain*, as *Inveterate* Enemies and Opposers
 of *Morality*? Pray, Sir, by what *Rules of Morality*
 have you allowed your self to fall into the Dread-
 ful Crime of *unbounded Calumny*? While, mean-
 while, you set up for a *Strenuous* Defender and
 recomender of *Christian Morals*?

--- Please, Sir, to read over again the *Preface*
Appendix to the *Second* Part of the *Marrow*
 and you will find therein, That *Holiness*, and

Morality is clearly explaind and Pathetically presented. Therein, you will find that the *Author* considers the *Holiness of God* as the Spring and Fountain of *Holiness in us*, and asserts, That, the *Holiness of the Divine Nature* is manifested unto us by the *Holiness of his Law*, which is the Express Image of his Will, That the Law is Holy and the Commandment *Holy Just and Good*. --- That it reacheth the whole Man --- Calls, not only for the *Doing* of all Good ; But the *Right Manner* of Doing it --- Injoins, not only the avoiding of Evil, but the detesting and abhorring it, and the shunning of all Occasions and Solicitations thereunto --- That, 'Tis Spiritual in its Nature, Exceeding broad in its Extent, and perpetual in its Duration --- And, That it is the Image of the Divine Purity, so, it is the Immediate Rule of Rectitude to us.

That *Author*, in Order to the clearing the Subject of Holiness, as now it is restored unto the Elect Sinner, Considers Man's Primitive State of Knowledge, Righteousness and Holiness, and Asserts, That, Albeit Man would have been bound to have observed the Holy Law stamped upon his Nature, tho' God had not entered into a Covenant with him, That, nevertheless the Lord was pleased to superadd the Obligation of a particular *Paction* to That of *Nature* ; in which Perfect, Personal and Perpetual Obedience was required, Life promised in Case of Performance and Death threatned upon the least Failure. That Man, being left to the Freedom of his own Will, sinned against God, and broke the Covenant of Freindship --- And here, the *Author* is so far from being at Enmity with *Morality*, That he sets forth the Evil Nature of Sin in very Pathetick Terms, and Represents

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 15

is Opposite unto the very Nature of God, and, strictly speaking, as *The only Evil*. --- He Maintains, That, Tho' Man by his Fall, hath rendered himself Incapable of Obeying God's Law, or enjoying his Favour, yet, nothing of the Obligation unto perfect Obedience is dissolved --- That all the Children of Disobedience, are under the Covenant of Works by Nature. --- And, because they cannot perform the Condition of Perfect Obedience, they fall under the Sanction of the threatned Curse --- He Asserts, That Man's Recovery is impossible unto himself --- And, That the Contrivance and Accomplishment of Redemption, tho' it be the most Wonderful Egress of Divine Grace and Mercy, with Respect to us, yet, it is in a Way of exact Justice and Righteousness, with Respect to our Surety, and is intirely founded upon, and Consistent with the Tenor of a broken Covenant which our Redeemer fulfils. --- He asserts, That the Offer of Christ and his Righteousness, is full, free, & Universal, but, That Nevertheless, till a Man be determined by Grace to believe, --- till by Union with Christ he Derive *Life* and *Influences* from him, he Remains under a Covenant of Works. --- And can bring forth no Fruits unto God, till he be Married to Christ. --- And, That, being united unto Christ, he becomes Dead to the Law as a Covenant of Works. Nevertheless, That the Law Remains to be a Rule of Life to him --- And, That he is under the strongest Obligations to Obey Gods Law, and to Study Conformity unto it, in all Points.

That Author Asserts, That the binding Power of the Law, as the Law, of the Eternal God, and Glorious Creator, is not, in the least, dissolved by the Law's coming unto the Believer, not

in that Channel *Alone*, but, in, and through the Hands of the Lord Redeemer, who is also Eternal God, and the Lord Creator --- Maintains, That the Believers Happiness ly in Holiness, or in a Conformity unto the Law --- and, That the Chief Principle of all Holiness lyes in a due regard unto the Authority of the Law-giver --- That, the Believer Considers not the Law as a *Mere Passive Rule* --- but looks on himself as under the strongest *Obligations* to Obedience from the *Authority* of the Glorious Law-giver --- which, he Asserts is not, in the least impaired, by His viewing it as conveyed to him thro' the Channel of a Redeemer. --- That under the deep Impression of *Obligation* to Obedience the Believer Essays it, Studies it, makes his great Concern and Care, and the very Business of his Life --- He Maintains, That the Chief part of Man's Happiness lyes in a Conformity unto the Holy Law of God --- That Believers are saved unto *Sanctification* which *Glory begun*, and unto *Glorification* which is *Sanctification consummated* --- and, That the Law is the Rule of This Sanctification, and is considered by the Believer as such. --- And that, to the Believer the Lords Commands are not Grievous. The Prefacer Asserts, That, tho' one who is not a new Creature may do many Things, which, as to the Matter of them, are commanded in the Law, yet nothing that he doth, is *True Obedience* unto God, because, whatsoever is not done in Faith is Sin : That, our *State* must be changed before we can do any Thing *Truely Good* and acceptable unto God --- That the unrenewed Man's Disposition of Soul stands in Opposition unto True Obedience. --- And, That an Inclination and Propensity of Heart to the Dutys of

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 21

the Law is Necessary to Frame and Enable us for the Immediate Practice of them --- That, Love is the Sum of the Law and a Principle of Obedience as well as the *Chief Branch* of it. And, That the Aversion and Enmity of the Unregenerate, is Inconsistent with this Love, *Rom.*

8. 7. --- That, therefore, while Man is in the State of Enmity to God, and while he hath no other Notions of him, but as an *Angry Judge*, no Views of Reconciliation with God, no Spiritual Disposition of real Love to God and Desire of Conformity to his Will, he can Perform no acceptable Obedience at all, unto his Law. ---

That, the new Nature is convey'd unto Christ's Spiritual Seed, in due Time, out of that Fulness that is in him -- That Union with Christ, is the Foundation of a Holy Practice; And, That upon it, all ability to do good Works, doth depend --- *Col* 3. 10, 11. And, that there can be no Holiness, but what flows from it -----

That, This Union with Christ is accomplished by our actual Receiving Christ himself --- & believing on Him --- That, this Faith, being an Holy Grace, and part of Spiritual Life, is not supposed to have a distinct Preexistence or Being in us, before the Beginning of Spiritual Life, but rather, is given to us, and wrought in, and with the very Constituting our Union with Christ.

--- And, That it is, *ever after*, the great *Instrument* of *Sanctification*, as well as it was of *Justification*. --- And, That it hath a Natural Tendency to Furnish the Soul with an Holy Frame --- being a Faith that worketh by Love.

That *Preface*, further teacheth, That True Holiness cannot be attain'd by our most vigorous Endeavours in a natural state --- That, a Man in that state cannot walk one step in the Way of True Holiness. --- That, nevertheless, This Inability,

Inability, doth not Discharge him of the Obligation thereunto. --- And so, That, it is needful, by the Preaching of the Gospel, to call Men to come forth out of that state. --- That, Men are not, under a Pretence of Inability, to sit still in an Inactive Manner, become indifferent, and not so much as Essay to Believe. --- That, we ought to Perform Duties as we can, --- Essay at Christs Command, to stretch out the wethered Hand. -- That, Christ is the Head of Influence and Strength ---- That there's a Necessity of Constant supplies out of his Fulness, --- That the only Way to attain True Repentance, and all other Graces, and Duties, is to come *First* to Christ by Faith, --- Seeing, no acceptable Duty can be performed, but *in* and *from* Faith, That Holiness is the chief part of our Salvation, And is to be considered as an *End* to be aimed at under this View, -- And not, meerly, as a *Means* to obtain Salvation.

The *Preface* tells us, That the *Gospel Minister* takes care, not only to Instruct People in the true meaning, the Spirituality, and Extent of the Divine Law, that they may have a Distinct Knowledge thereof; but doth direct in the Right way of attaining it. --- That, he makes *all* ways Gospel Doctrines, the Foundation of *His* Practice, -- Tho', sometimes, He may insist more upon the *One*, sometimes more upon the *Other*. --- That, having the State and Condition of his Hearers in his view, some whereof may be *Gracious*, and many *Graceless*, He, SO presseth *Holy* Duties as may be agreeable unto their various Conditions. -- That, he tells the *Unrenewed Man* His *Corrupt State* and *Utter Inability*, and, That this State must be changed before he can perform any one Duty aright --- That, he mu

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 23

me to *Christ* to get both Grace, Righteousness
and Strength from *Him*, -- And, Calls the Re-
deemed Man, to have recourse to that same Foun-
tain, from whence, Grace was conferred. ---
That, he Recommends Holiness, not Meerly as
the Way in order to the obtaining of *Eternal Life*,
but as the *Begun Salvation* of the Believer in
time: And sets forth it's native Beauty, as a Con-
comitancy unto the Divine Law, which is the
transcript of the Holiness of his Nature, ---
That he represents the exceeding Sinfulness of
man, -- And, That Holiness is the Happiness of the
rational Creature; And, That the bringing Men
thereunto was the great Design of *Christ's* under-
taking; and, That, to conceive of Happiness
without it is a Contradiction. --- That, he Re-
commends the Scriptural views of Holiness such
as living by Faith, *Hab. 2. 4. Gal. 2. 20 Heb. 10.*
8. walking by Faith, *2. Cor. 5. 7. Faith Working by*
Love, Gal. 5. 6. Overcoming the World by Faith.
Jo. 5. 4. &c. as in Page 41. 42. Which Phrases
do set forth the True Nature, of The Spring,
the Means, the End, and Manner of Holiness,
and the True Motives and Encouragements
thereunto, and lead the Soul to look to *Christ*
in the whole Practice thereof.

These Things and what follows in this *Preface*
and in the *Appendix*, do Breath forth such a
concern for inculcating Holiness of Life, in all
manner of Conversation, and in the true *Evan-*
gelical Way too, that it's truly Matter of Asto-
nishment, That any one should have had the
front to have represented *This Author* and others
of a like Strain, as Enemies to *Morality* and
Worse than *Heathens*, and under a great
many Harsh and Uncharitable Characters, But
let our *Essayer* be Saying. *Wisdom will be justifi-*

ed

ed of her Children. ----- And, I am perswaded no Sincere Christian, who reads these *Authors* whom our *Essayer* Busks up in such in uncouth Dress, will approve, either, of his *Wit* or *Honesty* in all This flourishing Harangue from Page 11 to Page 20, I Mean, as to *the Scope* of it, which is to point forth some of the Best *Friends* unto *Holliness* (both in the true Theory and Live Practice of it) as its *Downright Enemies* and *Opposers*. But I should now go on with the *Essayer*.

Page 20th. he says, As I can't look on the Preaching of Duties that the Moral Law Requires, to be *Legal*, far less can I Conceive the urging of *Faith* and *Repentance* to be *Legal*, I look on neither to be *Legal Duties*, &c. ---

One may easily Perceive, That our *Author* is somewhat Confused and Jumbled in his Notion of what is *Legal* and *not Legal*, he doth not at all state this Matter *truly* and *fairly*, but is so hurried in the Pursuit of the Harangue, that he runs away with the *Harrows*, and tears up some Pieces of Ground that are no way prepared for *the* either by *Tilling* or *Sowing*. And Therefore, before We can speak Intelligibly on this Point, to present the *Legal* or *Gospel* way of Preaching *Faith* and *Repentance*, we must Consider the True state of this Debate, and then, the *Authors* fallacy in his Harangue on this Head, being detected, his Reasonings will appear in, their Native Weakness. But having Detain'd you, Perhaps too long, in this Letter, I shall reserve This Subject unto our Next, and mean Time I Remain,

S I R,

Yours, &c.

L E T.

LETTER II.

S I R,

AT the Close of my *Last*, I mentioned what our *Essayer* proposeth next to Discourse upon, *viz. Faith and Repentance*; and now, I shall endeavour to follow him on That Subject, which, indeed Deserves a very particular Consideration.

Page 20th. He says, *As I can't Look on the Preaching of DUTIES that the Moral Law enjoins to be LEGAL, far less, can I Conceive the urging of FAITH and REPENTANCE to be LEGAL.* Now, Sir, Tho' this Sentence be True in it self, abstractly considered; yet, if we look upon our *Author*, as a *Disputant*, in this *Essay*, who sets up for clearing of a contraverted Truth, and stopping the Mouth of Gain-sayers, Then, as it stands in this Place, There are as many *Blunders* as *Words*, in it. For, who, ever pretended, That the Preaching of *Duties*, which the Moral Law Required, was *Legal*? Whatever, he, may alledge with respect to the *Grosser Antinomians*, yet, sure, He dare not stand to it, to affirm That *These Authors*, he pretends, Chiefly, to Confute, *viz. The Prefacer to the Second Part of the Marrow*, Mr. Gilbert, The late *Representers* against the *Assemblys Act*, or others like minded, do, so much as Insinuate, That Preaching the *Duties*, which the Moral Law enjoins, is *Legal*, or, That the urging of *Faith and Repentance* is *Legal*. No, These *Authors* bid Him, and all his *Associats*, a bold Defiance on this Head, and do, justly charge him with a *Detestable Slander*, in His
obvious

Obvious Insinuation of their being Guilty in this particular. They Maintain, That it is both Lawful and Expedient, and every Way Consistent with a Gospel Spirit and Frame, to Preach the Duties which the Moral Law enjoins, and to Urge *Faith* and *Repentance*, to the utmost of their Power. 'Tis not *The Preaching of These Things*, they Contend about, but *the Way and Manner of Preaching Them*, The neglecting or Superficial Touching of these Doctrines, that are necessary to lead the Minds of Poor Sinners into a View of the Source of Corruption, Their own Weakness, The Fountain of Strength in Christ, and to give these Duties their Proper Place and Use.

But to go on, The *Essayer's* Reason why he looks not on the urging of *Faith* and *Repentance* to be *Legal*, is a little surprizing, for, (says he) I look on neither to be *Legal Duties*. Very Good! Pray then, Mr. *Essayer*, will you look on the Preaching of these Duties, which you must own to be *Legal Duties*, (*i. e.* Duties which Man was bound unto under a Covenant of Works, Such as E. G. *Love to God, and of our Neighbour as our selves*. Which Comprehends the whole Law) to be *Legal Preaching*? If so, you must needs retract the *First* Part of the above quoted Sentence, and must no more say, *That you can't look on the Preaching of Duties, that the Moral Law Enjoins, to be LEGAL*; If you will not stand to This, you must own that the Reason you give why the urging of *Faith* and *Repentance* is not *Legal*, *viz.* Because you look on neither of 'em to be *Legal Duties*, is not cogent. In short, Sir, I don't think you, or your *Associats*, *These Ornaments of our Church* (as some of their fond Admirers affect to call them) have duely considered
this

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 27

this Controversy, I can't say you Talk, in this Place, like one who understands it, I had almost said that you have stumbled into the Weakness of that private Christian whom you Insult, Page 3d. viz. into a *Dark and Confused Jumble of Incoherent Notions*. Pray, tell me, Good Sir, Are there any Duties, to which we are bound, but what the Law of God binds us to? Are you yet to Learn, That the Law is exceeding Broad? And are there any Duties of the Law, but what may be called *Legal Duties*? i. e. Duties according to the Tenor of God's Law, which is an Eternal Rule of Righteousness? And, Did ever any Mortal pretend, or so much as insinuate that it was *Legal Preaching*, to Preach the Duties themselves which the Law Enjoins? Nay, did ever any Mortal pretend that it was *Legal Preaching*, to Open up a Covenant of Works, & to display it's Nature and Tenor? No, Sir, you seem to have no just Notion of this Matter. It is not the Preaching of *Legal Duties*, (for all Duties whatsoever are Legal Duties) but the Manner of Preaching them, viz. while, either they are urged to be performed as any Branch of our Righteousness, & Ground of our Claim of Happiness before God; or while due Cautions are not used to guard against making That perverse Use thereof: Or, while they are pressed upon Natural Men, in absolute Terms, with a great many Directions concerning their *Doing*, without such Cautions, as are necessary to let them know they have lost their Strength for *Doing*, and that they must depend on the Righteousness of Christ, and not *their own Doings*; and, That without Union with Christ they can do nothing acceptably; And That Christ is our alone Righteousness and Strength. Now, Sir, let a Man take
care

care to guard Matters thus, according to the *Spirit, Tenor, and Scope* of the *Gospel*, and I shall never call his Preaching of *Legal Duties themselves* **LEGAL PREACHING.**

But now to come a little more close to our *Critical Essayer*, He tells us he does not look upon *Faith* and *Repentance* to be *Legal Duties*. And even hugs himself in a very useless Harangue upon this Head, Page 20. and 21. The whole of what he says amounts to This, That *Faith* and *Repentance*, are Graces and Duties which could not be exercised in the State of Innocence, because inconsistent with that State. Now, when all this is granted to our *Essayer*, what will he make of it? Will he infer from thence, That because these Duties, in the Exercise of them, were not Consistent with the State of Innocence, That therefore they are not included in the *Primitive Original Law* given to *Adam*? Will he refuse That all Precepts whatsoever are Virtually & Really included in that *Law of Creation*, or of the *Ten Commands*, which was given to *Adam* in Paradise in the Form of a Covenant of Works? Will He pretend, That there ever was, or can be, an Instance of any Duty not commanded, Directly, or by Consequence in the Moral Law? What, tho' *Adam* was not Actually obliged to believe in a *Saviour* till, being lost and undone, a *Saviour* was revealed to him; Yet, doth not the same Command that bound him to Trust, Depend on, and to believe the Promises of *God Creator*, oblige him to believe in *God Redeemer* when Revealed? And did not the same Law, that bound him to have a sense of Sin in it's Evil Nature, and Dismal Effects, oblige him also to Mourn for it, when it should fall out? Sure, the Law given to *Adam* was exceeding

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 29

exceeding Broad, and must needs include what ever, afterwards, can be the Duty of a Creature, in any Circumstance; And Consequently, *Faith* and *Repentance* are Duties of the Law, *i. e.* Duties included in and Required by that Original Law given to *Adam*, tho' Man's Circumstances, in the State of Innocency, were Inconsistent with their Exercise. For, if the Law does not bind Sinners to Believe and Repent, how can *Faith* and *Repentance*, considered as Works be excluded from our Justification before God, seeing in that Case they are not Works of the Law, under which Character, all Works, are, in Scripture, excluded from the Use of Justifying in the Sight of God?

We have the more Cause to be concerned to Maintain this Extensive View of the Primary Law and its Obligation unto all the Duties which may come to be incumbent afterwards on the Creature as to Exercise, according to new Revelation of Objects, or New Circumstances, when we consider that, upon the contrary Doctrine *Arminius* laid, the Foundation of his Corrupt Principles, concerning *Sufficient Grace* or rather, *Natural Power* "*Adam* (said he) had "not Power to Believe in Jesus Christ, because "he needed him not, nor was he bound, so to "Believe, because the Law required it not, "Therefore, since *Adam*, by his Fall, did not "loose it, God is bound to give every Man "Power to Believe in Jesus Christ. And is it not well known, That *Socinians*, *Arminians*, *Papists* and *Baxterians*, by holding the Gospel to be a New, proper Preceptive Law with Sanction, do, thereby, turn it into a Real, tho' Milder Covenant of Works, confound the Law and the Gospel, and bring Works into the Matter and Course of a Sinners

ners Justification before God? And, what if we should add (which will, perhaps, be a little more surprising to some) That this Principle that makes *Faith and Repentance* only Duties of the *Gospel*, and not of the *Law*, hath been a Spring of *Antinomianism*? So sayeth Mr. *Cross*. *Serm. on Rom. 3. 27. P. 165.* History tells us (says he) " That *Antinomianism* Sprung from such " a Mistake, That *Faith and Repentance* were " Taught by the *Gospel* Only, and, That they " contained all necessary unto Salvation, so the " *Law* was needless.

Now, our *Essayer* seems not to have a Clear Notion of this Matter when he tells us P. 21. That the OBLIGATION to *Repent and Believe* arises from the New Dispensation or Covenant, God has been pleased Mercifully to make with us. --- I know no OBLIGATION unto Duties, but what must flow from a *Law*, except you will say, Such Considerations, as we call *Motives*, are an *Obligation*; which sure they are not, in a strict and proper Sense, whatever they may be in a more *Large* and *Improper Acceptation*. Now, if our *Essayer* Maintain that the OBLIGATION unto *Faith and Repentance*, ariseth from the *New Dispensation*, and if by *That* he mean the *Gospel* strictly taken, as *Contra-distinguished* from the *Law*, Then he goes in to the *NEONOMIAN* Doctrine, That the *Gospel* is a proper *Preceptive Law* with *Sanction*, which is a *Confounding* of the *Law* and *Gospel*; But, if by the *New Dispensation*, he understand the *Gospel* in a *Large Sense*, as *Comprehending* the whole Doctrine of the *Evangelists*, and *Apostles*, that do any way concern our *Salvation*; In that *Large Sense*, it is not to be, at all, doubted, but the *Gospel* lays an *Obligation* upon us unto *Faith and Repentance*, as
we

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 31
well as other Duties, and hence we are called to
OBEY the Gospel : but still, the OBLIGATION
to that Obedience, under the *Gospel Dispensation*,
arise from the Law, which is adopted into the
Christian Institution ; But, then, this is not the
Question in Debate.

But, Sir, to Trace this no further, I am sur-
prised with the Sentence, whereby our *Essay*
Concludes this Paragraph, P. 21 *How Unreason-
able must it be (says he) to Charge any with LEGAL-
ISM for insisting upon Duties, That are PURELY
and PROPERLY Evangelical.* Now, Sir, I would
ask our *Essay*, in the *First Place*, how he came
to alledge such a Gross *Falshood* and *Calumny*, as
if any of those *Authors*, he pretends to confute, did
Charge Men with *Legalism* for insisting on the
Duties of Faith and Repentance ? I would ask him,
in the next Place, what he means by *Purely* and
Properly Evangelical ? Does he mean that these
Duties are not Duties of the Moral Law ? Doth
he Maintain that there is any other Rule of
Duty, properly Speaking ? If so, he is indeed,
so much for Cashiering the Law, that he is an
ANTINOMIAN with a Witness.

He proceeds P. 21. To consider the Relation of
Faith and Repentance unto *Forgiveness of Sins*, and
falls immediatly to his *Proofs*, without either
explaining Terms, or stating the Question fair-
ly, which hath been the *Good, Old Way*. He
would have us take Things as they ly in the
Surface of his *General Expressions*. And to prevent
our further *Enquiry*, he thinks fit (P. 22.) to
Harangue a little upon the *Usefulness* of (what he
Calls) *Quirks and Subtilties* in determining *Theolo-
gical Questions*. I can't tell what *Quirks and Subtil-
ties* he hath in his View, as to the present
Question. But I hope he won't refuse the Use

of proper Distinctions, without which a Perpetual Logomachy in all Reasonings upon Divinity is inevitable. Nor do I see any Necessity of Thumbing *Suarez Ariaga &c.* Before we can know our Creed. The due Consideration of the *Scripture*, and prudent use of the Terms used both by *Christian Councils* and *Privat Orthodox Writers*, being sufficient to furnish us with pertinent Distinctions for clearing Contraversies in Divinity.

As to his Quotation from Mr. *Robert Blair* P. 23. Howsoever it might do well enough in a *Popular Audience*, when the worthy Man inclined to shift determining that Point; Yet, our *Essayer* himself doth not think it *Decisive*: For tho' he pretends to approve it, and to wish we could Imitate the Eminent Man's Wisdom therein; Yet he proceeds to Determine the Question anent the *Priority of Faith and Repentance* very *Dogmatically*, which puts me in mind of the Popish NON OBSTANTE; For (says he) P. 23 "Tho' I suppose, a *Dogmatical Decision* of this Question to be very USELESS; YET, I'm of the mind that it is of *bad Consequence* to hold, That *Repentance* is not necessary, IN ORDER to our *Forgiveness*. Now, I should think it very USEFUL to Determine a Question, where one side of it is of such *bad Consequence*. Nor can it be a *Thorny Question* if it be so easy to Determine it, as our *Author* pretends it is, from *Common Sense*, The *Scripture*, and our *Standard*; And so he proceeds to determine That Question which he had declared USELESS.

The Position he lays down P. 23. *Is, That it is of bad Consequence to hold, That Repentance is not necessary, in Order to our Forgiveness.* And without explaining the Terms, or stating the Question

in GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 33

question he goes on to his *Proofs*, and after he hath endeavoured thereby to prepossess the Reader, He does, then, Suggest some Things P. 33. &c. Under the Notion of the Rise of Mistakes about this *Question*, which I Conceive should have been placed before Them. But I must adjourn the consideration of **THESE** *Proofs*, till I have taken Notice of what our *Author* proposes, as the Rise of Mistakes about this *Question*, P. 3. &c.

The I. of Them is, " The not observing, That tho' Faith *Alone* Justifies, (This is its peculiar Office & it has an Aptitude, or Fitness for it.) Yet That Faith is never *Alone*, but always attended with *Repentance*, its Inseparable Companion.

Now, This I agree unto as a Truth in it self, but the not observing it, must be a Rise of Mistakes on the side of the *Essayer*, and his *Abettors*; or, if *Repentance* be Faith's *Attendant* and *Companion*, it must be *Posterior* to it, at least, in the Order of Nature, That being the proper Place of ATTENDANTS, and COMPANIONS. Especially, if we consider, that *Faith* hath a peculiar Office, which *Repentance* hath not.

The II. is, The not observing, That, tho' The *Assenting Act* of Faith, must be considered in Order before *Repentance* (for it is not possible for a Sinner to Repent who Believes not the Promises of *Grace*, and *Salvation* thro' Christ, and has not *Some Apprehension* of obtaining Mercy thro' his Blood) yet The receiving of Christ held forth in the *Promises*, the Soul's Acquiescence in the Device of Salvation, and Relyance on Jesus, That he may get it, is never **WITHOUT** *Repentance*; For, how can a Man Flee to Jesus for Pardon, who has

"not a Sense of his Lost and Undone Con-
 "dition, is not willing to be eased of his Load
 "Guilt, and resolved to have no more to
 "do with Sin. This, he must, of necessity, ha-
 "ve who Receives Christ as he is offered in
 "the Gospel. Now, our *Essayer* I think, Gra-
 "duates here upon the Matter, That *Saving Faith*
 "comes before *Repentance*, for he Allows it the
 "First Step, in its *Assenting Act*, & Determines, in so
 "doing, which Foot goes foremost; But then, he tells
 "us, The *Receiving Act* is never WITHOUT
 "*Repentance*. TRUE; But, may not that *Receiv-*
 "ing be in order of *Nature* before it, and yet
 "without it One Moment in Order of *Time*?
 "But, tho' we should grant to our *Author*, That
 "the *Repentance* here describ'd is before the
 "receiving Act, I see nothing he Gains by it in the
 "Question; for, a Man by Convictions from
 "the Law, may be sensible, That he is in a Lost and
 "Undone Condition, and may be willing to be
 "eased of his Load of Guilt, and resolved to ha-
 "ve no more to do with Sin. Nay, This we own
 "to be necessary before receiving Christ, but we do
 "not think this a True Account of *Evangelical Repen-*
 "*tance*, which, besides all this, must have a Sen-
 "se of Sin as truly Abominable in its own Nature,
 "and hateful to God, and must have a real loathing
 "of it, arising from a Principle of Love to God.
 "All which can't be till the Soul be united to
 "Christ by *Faith*. But, tho' we should yield
 "more to our *Author*, yet even, according to his
 "*Faith* hath the *Precedence*. For, he hath granted
 "That it hath the *First Step*, viz. in its *Assenting*
 "*Act*; Now, suppose the next Step should be al-
 "lowed unto that Act of *Repentance*, which Consists
 "in a *Sense* of our *Lost* Condition and of a *Load*
 "of *Guilt*, yet the next Step must be, *Faith's* receiving

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 35
Saviour, which goes before the compleating Act
Repentance, viz. *Turning from Sin*. And so,
even according to this Scheme, *Faith* hath the
precedence, Step by Step, in its Respective Acts,
into the several Acts of Repentance. And so, in
as well as the former, our Author's Arrow returns
on Himself. The III. is The not considering the
Difference which flows from a Sense of the Love
of God in Christ, and that which ariseth from an
Apprehension of obtaining Mercy thro' him,
&c. P. 34. The *First*, he owns to be *Posterior*
Faith and Forgiveness; The *Second* to be *before*
Forgiveness. Being, then, agreed as to the *First*,
our Dispute will be about the *Second*. And
is too, I think our Author hath determined
at the Head of this 34 P. he owns, That
'Tis, not possible for a Sinner to Repent, who
Believes not the *Promises of Grace* and Salvation
thro' Christ, and has not some Apprehension
of obtaining Mercy thro' his Blood. This
Relief, then, and Apprehension of Mercy goes be-
fore Repentance. But, to use the Authors Phrase,
is it possible that a Sinner can have a *True, Saving*
Relief of the *Promises of Grace* and Salvation
thro' Christ, and Apprehension of obtaining Mercy
thro' his Blood, and have no Sense of the Love
of God in Christ, as our Author seems to Insi-
nuate by his Manner of distinguishing them?
I acknowledge there are Degrees of This Sense
of Gods Love in Christ, But how a Sinner can
truly, Believe the *Promises of Grace* and Sal-
vation thro' Christ, and have an Apprehension
of obtaining Mercy thro' his Blood, without
some Degree of the Sense of Gods Love, in the
Application, which, by Faith, he makes of these
several Promises to himself in particular, I cannot
understand. Nor do our Author's Illustrations
clear this Matter. Does he think it peculiar to

that Assurance, which he Describes, for a Person to look on God, as his Merciful Father in Christ, his best Friend, and greatest Benefactor? And upon the other Hand, Is this all that he will allow to that Belief of the Promises and Apprehension of Mercy (without which he had said Just now that it was impossible for the Sinner to Repent) That the Sinner only Arrives thereby at a MAY BE, that God will be Mercifull to him through Christ? If this be all, the External sound of The Gospel intertain'd by a Common and General Assent, that is not SAVING, will reach as far. And doubtless, it is the Knowledge of the Gospel Sound, affording The Sinner this MAY BE, that doth keep the awakened Conscience from utter Despair, under Legal Terrors, before they have any Thing of Saving Grace. But surely, the Saving Faith of God's Elect hath more than such a General MAY BE, in its Nature, even an appropriating and applying Act.

The IV is The not observing That Repentance into Life, that is necessary to Forgiveness, " doth not Actually include in it Holy Obedience, &c." P. 35. Here our *Essayer* differs from P. Haddam. The pretended *Detector*; for that Famous Author will have the Grace, and N. B. The Duty of Repentance, which, so considered, takes in Obedience, to go before Forgiveness, and explains himself clearly by the Term Forsakeing of Sin, which I think, is a Considerable Branch of New Obedience. Our *Essayer* owns in General, That Holy Obedience is the Fruit of Faith, but why not the Resolutions and Purposes he Speakes of too? Must not Holy Obedience have a Beginning in Point of Exercise? And what are these Purposes and Resolutions, and this Grief for & Hatred of Sin, but the Beginnings of the Exercise, and so, Repentance

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 37

Parts of *Holy Obedience*? And why these should
 Christ, likewise, be Fruits of *Faith*, I see not.
 As the *Essayer* Grants that *Obedience* is not neces-
 sary, to a Sinners Justification in Gods Sight,
 yet he will have *Repentance Resolutions* to have no
 more to do with Sin, *Grief* and *Hatred* of it,
 and *Purposes of New Obedience*, to be *Qualifications*
 in the Person, N. B. TO BE justified, as if
 these were not **OBEDIENCE**. In short, Sir,
 our *Essayer's* Notions, here seem to me, to be
 a little jumbled and *Incoherent*. He'll have
 the Object of Justification, to be a Sinner quali-
 fied by several Steps of Obedience, he'll have
 one who hath obeyed the Commands of God
 in repenting of his Sins, Hating them and being
 Grieved for them, resolving to have no more to
 do with them, and when he's thus qualified,
 Then says he N. B. He is TO BE justified,
 which Imports, that he must have all these Quali-
 fications in his Person before he be justified, and
 yet he Grants That *Holy Obedience* is the *Fruit*
 of *Faith*, and Consequently of Justification, This
 Doctrine of *Previous, Gracious Qualifications* in
 the Person TO BE justified, appears to me to
 be contrary to that Scripture --- He justifieth
 the *Ungodly*. No, Says our *Essayer*, The Man
 who is TO BE justified must be *A Godly Man*
 before he be justified. But, I always thought,
 That our *Orthodox Divines* had been so careful
 to Guard against such a Causality of Works in
 our Justification, that they would not allow *Faith*
 to be considered, As a *Work* in that Case.
 But sure, These Gracious Qualifications can
 come under no other Consideration, but that of
 a *Work*, or of *Holy Obedience*. And if this be not
 to bring *Works* into the Cause of Justification, I
 know not what is. Our Standard Larg. Catech.
 in

in the Quest. How is *Justification* an *Act* of *Grace*? Expressly says, that God **REQUIRE** nothing of us for our *Justification* but *Faith*. And so excludes all *Works* as necessary **IN ORDER** to it, tho' they immediatly attend and company it; and so, it is never **WITHOUT** the *Truth*. The V. is, that "wrong *Notions* about the Freedom of *Grace* are a Plentiful Source of Mistake in the *Antinomians* and others. As to the *Antinomians* I heartily Condemn their Mistakes and Misimprovements of *Free Grace*. But as to the *Others*, whom he pretends to Confute, they indeed think, *Free Grace* admits not these *Gracious Qualifications* in us, before *Faith* and *Justification*; And, tho' they own *Faith* to be necessary, unto *Justification*, as an *Instrument*; yet they will not have it considered as a *Work*, and *Gracious Qualification*. And they plainly Assert the necessity of *Holiness* unto *Eternal Happiness*; and the *Essayer* cannot Purge himself of *Deliberate Calumny* in affirming, that they say otherwise.

But now, after all these great Discoveries, which our *Author* pretends here to have made of the *Source of Mistakes*, upon the Matter under our Consideration, The True state of this Question concerning *Faith* and *Repentance*, and the Relation unto *Forgiveness*, needs to be further cleared, from P. 23 to P. 33.

Tho', Perhaps, our *Author* thinks, That every Body should know, at first Proposal of his Position, What is meant by *Repentance* and *Faith* and *Forgiveness*, and the *Necessity* and *Order* of These; yet I'm perswaded, That even a Learned *Essayer* may fall into a *Jumble of Incoherent Notions*, unless these Terms be well explain'd.

Let us, then, *First*, consider what *Repentance* is about which the *Question* is. Sure,

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 39
of Gospel Word *Repentance*, hath various Acceptations in
Scripture, and, 'Tis fit we know what *Repentance*
we are contending about. If we should go to
Work in determining This, according to R. P.
and *Madew's* way, I'm perswaded we should never
come to have clear Notions of this Question.
For, after he had told us in his *Sixth Chap. Ant.*
Mistake. That its neither *Legal fits and Terrors*, nor,
that self loathing & Mourning which flows from a
sense of Pardon, he adds, very Judiciously, That
the Question is not about *Repentance unto Life*.
Now, what must it be then? This *Profound*
Scholar is not at a loss here, For he very Learnedly
tells us, That the Question is about REPEN-
TANCE IT SELF. But, This Description of
Repentance, by REPENTANCE IT SELF, is
too Deep for my Dull Pate, especially when The
hath it seems excluded *Repentance* in the Root,
as a principle and Habit, for he tells us it is the
Deliberate and N. B. The Duty of *Repentance* which
takes in the Exercise of that Grace in an Active
manner. And so it seems this *Repentance it self* is the
actual Forsaking of Sin; But how it can be so accord-
ing to the Principal, I cannot comprehend seeing
this Forsaking of Sin belongs to *Repentance unto*
Life, and the P. tells us 'tis not *Repentance unto*
Life about which the Question is. And, in
short, I know not what to make of the P's *Repentance*;
at ever if it be not *Repentance unto Life*, he may Fight
about it as long as he pleases, and set it in what
place he Thinks fit. But then, is our *Essayer* any
thing more Distinct about this? Much about
Essay Bind, For P. 23. he tells us in General, That
is of bad Consequence to hold That *Repentance*
i. e. no doubt *Repentance it self*) is not Necess-
ary in Order to Forgiveness.
But, To set this Matter in a clear Light, let
us

A REVIEW of an ESSAY,
 us consider, That the Question is not, about
 That *Legal Fear and Terror*, which ariseth from
 Convictions by the Law, and a Spirit of *Bondage*
 whereby a Sinner may be Sensible both of his
State and Need of a Saviour, and may Feel the
 heavy Weight of the Load of Guilt on his Con-
 science. This we own is previous unto *Faith*
 but then, we Refuse that This is *True Evangelical Repentance*; For, all this may be, without
 a *True Regard* to the *Authority of God*, and *Since*
Love to him, and unto Holiness as his Image, and
 hatred of Sin as contrary unto his *Holy Nature*
 and *Will*, as well as Destructive to the Sinner
 which are Essential and inseparable Ingredients
 in *True Gospel Repentance*.

Neither is the Question about Repentance
 the *Root and Habit*, For, when we own *Faith*
 to be necessary in *Order* to *Forgiveness*, This im-
 plys that There is a Spirit of *Regeneration* in
 planting the Habits of all These Graces at once
 but, the Question is about the *First Exerting*
Out-going of *Repentance*, in these Acts of a *True*
Sense of Sin as contrary to the *Holy Nature* and
Will of God, a real *Grief* for it, *Hatred* of it, and
Turning from it, on that very Account, from
 Principle of *True Love* to God, and Regard
 to his will, viz. Whither These Acts do Preceed
 saving *Views and Grips* of Faith, whereby, The
 Legally awakened Sinner, under Heavens In-
 fluences, beholds the Glory of God in the Face
 of Christ, sees his *Falseness* and *Suitableness*, and co-
 dially Receives and Embraces him, as the Lord
 his Righteousness, with an *Applying* and *Appropriating*
 Act of *Faith*, founded on the *Promises* and
Gospel-offers, considered as directed particularly
 to Him. The Question is, Whether *Faith*, thus
 acting, must Usher in the *Evangelical Exercise*
 of *Repentance*.

ON GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 41

Repentance? Or, if there can be such Exercise thereof without These Views and outgoings of *Faith*, whereby the Soul is United and Married unto Christ, and then produceth the Truth of that Marriage, whereof the Repentance formerly described is none of the least Considerable?

Nor is the Question anent *Repentance*, taken in its most large Acceptation, for the whole of *Conversion*, nay the whole of a *Holy Life of Obedience*, in which Respect, it Comprehends *Faith* it self, and is, sometimes, put for it.

The Question then plainly is about That *True Evangelical Repentance*, which is called *Repentance unto Life*, and, is well defined in our Catechism, *A Saving Grace whereby a Sinner out of a True Sense of Sin, and Apprehension of the Mercy of God in Christ, doth, with Grief and Hatred of his Sin, Turn from it, unto God, with full Purpose of and Endeavour after New Obedience.* Now, The Question is if the Soul can exert This *True Evangelical Repentance* without, or before *Faith*.

But next let us consider what *That Faith is*, which we have now under Consideration. And, without insisting, It's not a common Dogmatical, Historical, Temporary Faith, but that Saving Faith of Gods Elect described in our Catechism, *A Saving Grace whereby we Receive and rest upon Christ Alone for Salvation, as he is freely offered in the Gospel.* 'Tis, *That Faith* which beholds Christ's Fulness and Suitableness, and flees to him as a City of Refuge, and Relys on him as the Soul's alone Righteousness and Strength. *That Faith* which brings Christ and the Soul together, and is the Bond of Union. *That Faith*, which receives Christ and Applies him for Remission of Sins, and which brings the Sinner unto an Unalterable State of Justification. The Question, then,

then, is if the Spirit of Regeneration, whereby Spiritual Life is Infused, and all the Habits of Grace at once Implanted, doth *First* draw forth the Soul into these *Views*, and *Gift* of *Christ*, and so establish the *Marriage Union*, and *Relation* betwixt Him, and the Sinner, so receiving Him, before that Soul *Exert* these Acts of *Repentance*, as Fruits of that Marriage Relation, which 'Tis Faith's peculiar Office to Constitute, and which Acts of Repentance, and likewise of other Graces are never sepearte from *Faith*, but are it's Constant and Permanent Concomitants and Attendants.

But further, We must also consider what is mean't by *Pardon*, and *Justification* in the Present *Question*. For, Orthodox Divines Speak of Justification *Fundamental*, and of Justification *Actual*, of Justification in *Fore Divino*, and Justification in *Fore Conscientiæ*, and of The Justification of a *Man's Faith* in *Fore Mundi*, and of Justification Sentential at the Great Day, and of *Pardon* of a *Sinner* and of a *Saint*.

Now the Question is not about That Fundamental Justification in the Death of Christ for the Elect, whereby, he satisfied *Divine Justice* in their Room and Stead; For this, he will own, is not only *Before* Repentance, but *Before* the very *Being* of many of Them. But the Question, is anent that *Actual Justification* and *Pardon* which is applyed unto the Sinner Himself. But then the Question is not as to Justification of a *Man's Faith* in *Fore Mundi*; For, there's no debate about this that *Repentance* and *Good Works* too, must make way for *That*; Nor, is the Question anent *Sentential Justification*, at the *Last Day*; For, no doubt, both *Repentance*, *Good Works*, and the whole Course of *Holy Obedience* goes before *That*.

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 43

That Kind of Justification. The Question then will be, about that Justification which more immediatly Relates, and is apply'd unto a Man's Person. Now, as to the present Question anent the *Precedence* of Repentance to *Justification*, his is not anent *Declarative* Justification, as to a Man's Sense and Feeling of it; For, Repentance may go before *This*, but anent *Real Justification* in *Foro Divino*. Again the Question is not anent Justification and Pardon of *God's Children* for their Sins, after they are in a Justified State, wherein God deals with them, not as an *Angry Judge*, but an *Offended Father*, and removes the Tokens of his *Fatherly Displeasure*, and Restores them unto the Joy of God's Salvation. For we own, That Repentance and very deep Repentance too, usually Ushers in this Kind of Pardon and Justification. But, The *Question* is anent That Justification of the *Guilty Sinner*, wherein God Acts as a *Judge*, That *Justification* which is introduced by the very first Act of Justifying Faith, laying hold on, and applying the *Surety-Righteousness*, and which, some, not unfitly call *Constitutive Justification*, because in this, The Elect Sinner is *Constituted* and *Unalterably fixed* in a Justified State, and can never, again, come under *Law-Condemnation*, or, The Curse. Now the *Question* is, If *Repentance* and such *Gospel Qualities*, in the Act and Exercise of them, do go before this *Constitutive Justification* in *Foro Divino* and *Conscientia*.

But then as to the *Terms, Necessity* and *Order*. We make no Debate about the *Necessity* of Repentance IN A Justified Person, for we own that *Repentance* is an inseperable *Attendant* and Concomitant of *Saving Faith* and Justification; But the *Question* is as to the *Order of Nature*,
Whether

Whether *Repentance*, in its Exercise, as formerly described, goes before Faith and Justification; or, is to be conceived as a Fruit thereof, tho' instantly produced, without distance of Time, at least, as to the first Beginnings of its Exercise. For, otherways, *Faith* and *Repentance* both, are the very Scope and Exercise of the whole Life of a True Christian.

Now, upon the whole, I suppose, the Question comes to this, whether True *Evangelical Repentance* in its Act and Exercise, as above described, does go before True *Evangelical Faith*, as above also explained, and that *Constitutive Justification* of a Sinner in *foro Divino* and *Conscientiæ*, which brings them into an unalterable State of Justification, or, if it only follows *These* as the Fruit and constant Concomitant and Attendant thereof.

The *Essayer*, P. *Hadow* and others Maintain the the *Former*. At least, in Their Way of stating the Question, They Maintain that *Repentance* goeth before Justification; But a great many others with whom I join Maintain the *Later*.

Now, having thus, I hope, cleared our Way, I shall Return unto P. 23. where our *Essayer* begins His Reasonings, to prove the *Priority* of *Repentance* unto *Faith* and Forgiveness, From these *Three Grand Topicks*, The *Common Sense* of *Mankind*, The *Sacred Oracles*, and our *Standard*.

What our *Author* says P. 23. and 24. of the *Placableness* of the *Divine Nature*, as a Notion that hath Universally obtained, and which lyes at the Bottom of all Religion, appears to me to be an Argument against his *Position*, from the *commonSense* & understanding of *Mankind*: For,

This

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 45

This Notion of Divine Mercy, is a Sort of Faith, or Belief, concerning God, without which Men would no more have Worshiped him than Devils. Now, how can we conceive that Men would Repent of their Sins, which is, no doubt, a Branch of Worship and Homage unto an offended Deity, if they look'd on him as Inexorable? 'Tis plain, then, That, so far as Men by the Light of Nature, have any Notions of Repentance as their Duty, They have Notions of Divine Mercy and Placability as the very Foundation of this Duty, and Consequently, That Faith goes before Repentance and Forgiveness, according to the Common Sense of Mankind.

'Tis true, we can't in Reason, expect, That the Sovereign of Heaven and Earth, will indemnify our Crimes, and suffer us one Moment, notwithstanding that Indemnity to continue Impenitent, and with unrelenting Hearts to go on Insulting his Laws and Government, but do we not see that he leads to *Repentance* by his Goodness? That he Draws by the *Cords of Love* and Bonds of a Man? And must not this *Goodness* be believed, and *this Love* relyed on by *Faith*, before we can be led and drawn thereby?

Had our *Author* considered, that we Maintain, That the bringing Men to *Repentance* and *Holiness* is the very End and Design of all those Revelations of Devine Goodness and Mercy, which are proposed as the Objects of *Faith*, he would have spared, his *Flights* in such Expressions as these P. 25: *God can't Pardon & Forgivethe Impenitent, --- It can't stand with the Wisdom of his Government to Dispense his Pardons to Impenitent Wretches, who go on affronting his Laws. ---* Had he considered That *Repentance* and *Reformation* are the very End, immediatly reached by the saving Views of a Reconciled God, held forth in the *Promises* and

and *Gospel-offers*, and Rely'd on by *Faith*, He would not have talk'd so Big of Pardoning *Impenitent Wretches*, &c. And had he considered That God can and doth *Change the Heart*, as well as *Pardon* the Sinner, He would have spared his Comparison from Wise Governours pardoning Criminals. I would here ask a Question or two at our *Essayer*, for my Information. Pray, Good Sir, does no Wise Governours Pardon any Criminals but those who are Penitent? What, if some Wise Governours should Judge, that Gratitude is such an Innermost Sentiment in our Souls, that they might look on it as an excellent Mean for reducing the Rebels into a Cordial Obedience and Subjection, to Pardon Them even before they give the least Sign of their Relenting? Indeed, it must be acknowledged, that some Men are so Wretched, that the greatest Favours won't move them; But seeing we are now Reasoning about the common Sense of Mankind, I ask you Sir, whether does not common Sense say, that they should be moved by such a Favour? and if this common Principle did always take effect, whither would it not be Consistent with the Wisdom of a Governour to give forth his Pardon freely to such Rebels as he thought fit, and for other Ends of Government, let Justice take Place on others, tho' both the *one* and the *other* be a like Guilty and alike Impenitent? Now, Sir, In the Case of Pardoning the Sinner, the Pardon always takes Effect, the End of *Repentance and Reformation* is reached, The Power of God is exerted in this Channel of Grace, to bring the Soul to True *Evangelical Repentance*, in the Way of *Faiths* Recourse unto, and *Application* of Christ for Righteousness.

Tis true, Sir, That wise Governours do Pardon

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 47

don Criminals in such a way, as to secure the Government from Contempt, and prevent Man's breaking in upon the Laws, in hopes of an Easy and Cheap Indemnity. But what is all this to the Purpose? Does this say that they Pardon *no Criminals* but *the Penitent and Relenting*, If so then Either *King George* is not a *Wise Governour*; or we had not heard of new *Plots*, against his *Life and Government*, even after an Ample Indemnity. But, Sir, may not Wise Governours secure the Government from Contempt by allowing Justice to take Place upon Some, and Pardoning Others tho' Impenitent, at the same Time, in hopes that Their Clemency will make them to Relent? And hath it not many Times had this effect on Generous Spirits? But whatever may be said about the Management of Wise Governours, who, howsoever Wise, have not Mens Hearts in their Hands. What is all this to the Case betwixt God and the Sinner? For when God Pardons, he also Changes the Sinners Heart. That Faith, which receives the Righteousness of Christ, for *Pardon*, is also *The great Mean of Purifying the Heart*. And these are never separate. But the Question is, which is the true and Proper Order? For my part I can't but say, I am surpris'd to find our Essayer's Reasonings about this Order. The whole Scope of what he says, P. 26 and 27 is, too plainly to insinuat, that we must have some *Price* in our Hands, in *Order* to our being Pardoned: If this be not his Design, what Means He, when speaking of the Case of *Justification*, to Talk about a *Government's* Regard to *Friends*, and not to Foes in lavishing out it's Favours, anent the Objects of Pardon being **DULY QUALIFIED**, and
N. B. Anent God's **REGARD TO Penitency.**?

These

These Expressions Savour too much of a *Legal Spirit* indeed, and appear to me, to be inconsistent with the Nature and Tenor of a Covenant of Grace. Indeed if God should Pardon *Impenitent Sinners*, and suffer them To remain *Impenitent*, There would be some Colour for his Inferences, that then his Hatred of Sin could not appear, and that this would be inconsistent with his Immaculate Holiness; but, If God displays the Glory of his Mercy and Holiness too, in bringing the Ungodly to True Repentance in this way of determining their Souls to lay hold on Christ by *Faith*; Where are all these fearful Consequences he Dreams of, about this Matter?

Our Author pretends, That Pardoning with a *Regard to Penitency as a Previous Quality*, gives us higher Notions of the Untainted *Purity* and *Holiness* of God, than Pardoning, only, upon a previous Satisfaction; But I see no Weight in his Reasoning on this Head, If it be but considered, That, altho' the previous *Satisfaction* be the Ground and Foundation of the Pardon, yet, the Sinner is not Actually Pardoned, till *Faith* receive and *Apply* this Satisfaction, and, if *Repentance* follow as an immediate and constant Fruit of This *Faith*, what shadow of Ground can our Author have for his Reasonings on this Head? We say, the Mercy and Justice, Truth and Holiness of God are most Evidently illustrated in the Gospel-way of Gods Pardoning the *Ungodly* for his own Names Sake, in the Way of drawing forth their Hearts by *Faith* to close with Christ, as the Source and Spring of all Gracious Qualities in us, and which flow from him by vertue of our Union with Him, which is constituted by *Faith* alone. In this way, God's Glorious Grace is most Conspicuously manifested in Pardoning freely,
for

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING 49

his own Name Sake, without REGARD, as
 Author will have it, unto our Repentance ;
 and, while, in this Way, the Sinner is melted
 down into true Godly Sorrow. The Honour of
 Divine Holiness and Justice, is no less Ef-
 fectually secured in this Way, God makes the
 Sinner feel by Painful Sensation, what an Evil
 and Bitter Thing it is to Depart from God, and
 the Throws and Pangs of Repentance im-
 parts our Sweet Morfels to us. I know not
 indeed what our Author means by Painful Sen-
 sations and Throws, and Pangs of Repentance ;
 He mean *Legal* Fits of Fear and Terror,
 these are out of the Question ; for we deny not
 that these go before true Faith and Forgiveness :
 but if he Mean true Evangelical Repentance,
 how *nothing more fit*, to bring the Soul into
 these Painful Sensations of the Evil of Sin, and
 such Throws and Pangs of Repentance, as may
 effectually Imbitter our Sweet Morfels to us,
 that we may Loath them as much as ever we
 loved them, and no more return to Folly ; Than
 the Views of the Satisfaction made by the
 Death of Christ. Nor, can I conceive, how a
 Person can have such Painful Sensations as are
 of an *Evangelical Nature*, without such Views by
 Faith, of the Redeemer's Blood, Shed for the Re-
 mission of Sins. 'Tis *Looking on him whom we*
have pierced, That draws forth true Evangelical
 Mourning, & that Sorrow that is of a Godly Sort.
 Indeed, the Law set home upon the Conscience
 may bring a Person into *Painful Sensations*, and
 such *Throws and Pangs of Fear and Terror* : And,
 these likewise, may Imbitter Sin in a Conside-
 rable Measure, but I must say, it Smells Rank of
Legal Spirit to think these Painful Sensations
 Sin, and Throws, and Pangs of Repentance,

D

which

which are previous unto Faith and, Pardons (says
 be *True Repentance*. And I am perswaded, e, That
 nothing can truly Imbitter Sin as Sin, and be Forg
 the Soul into true Humiliation for it, He in this
 of it, Self Loathing, and turning from it, he calls
 Faith's Views of a Crucified Christ. And *Distinct*
 also perfectly satisfied, that, in this Way that we f
 cannot but have more high and Elevated No what he
 both of God's *Mercy* and *Goodness*, and as he add
Justice and *Holiness*; than by conceiving of is Head,
 Pardoning with *Regard* to our Penitency, any furt
 Gracious Quality. Let this Author or his make a
 bettors Smooth over this their Doctrine as into the
 please, There is a Snake in the Grass. The as to Act
 Poison at the Root of it, It Smells Rank tted out.
 Foul and Motley Mixture of some Thing of gle it, whi
 own *Righteousness* with Christ, in the Case of self, who
fication; For what else can it be, when 'tis 91. 11. l
 sidered as a Thing God *Regards* as a Grac thy Ways.
 Quality in us, in *Order* to his Pardoning us, but such a
 so and so fitted and Qualified for Pardon imitated
 am far rather for keeping *Paul's Good Old* ng out,
 of being *Justified* by Faith, without the Ws. *The T*
 of the Law. I am convinced, no Works w *REFORE*
 forever take Place in the Case of Justification, *Sins may b*
 previous, Gracious Quality, which God Reg *REFRESH*
 in bestowing his Pardons. No this would be *SENCE*
another Gospel, and a *Perverting of the Gospel* of O left out t
 Nor, do we, by Maintaining this Doctrine] where.
 Faith, make Void the Law, but establish it. *RSION* a

But now, Our Author, P. 28. Being, it se therefore
 sensible, That Reasoning on this Point, *Sins*, must b
 the Common Sense of Mankind, is not so le Work of
 Conclusive, proceeds P. 29 to His *Second* G hardly t
Topick, The Sacred Oracles of God. aside Prej

The First Text he mentions is Acts. III. to go bef
 "Repent, That your Sins may be blotted out. if he had

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING: 51
 (says he) pretty plain, from this Pas-
 That we must *Repent* before our Sins
 be Forgiven us. --- The *Essayer*, once and
 in this Book, insists Powerfully against
 he calls *Quirks of Wit, Arts of Criticism, and*
Distinctions, P. 31. 'Tis Evident his *Design*
 is that we should not too narrowly Enquire
 what he calls, the obvious Meaning of the
 he adduceth. But tho' his Thunderings
 Head, might do much to fright a BODY
 by further Examination of his *Glosses*; Yet
 make an Adventure to enquire into them,
 to the true Meaning of these Texts.
 to Acts. III. 19. *Repent that your Sins may*
be blotted out. --- The *Prudent Man* thinks fit to
 it, which was an Old Trick of the *Devil*
 who in Tempting *Christ* and Quoting
 I. 11. leaves out these Words, *To keep thee*
by Ways. But, who would have thought,
 such a *Worthy Man* as our *Essayer* would
 imitated the *Enemy of Mankind* herein, by
 out, that which quite Confounds his
The Text, as it stands full, *Is, Repent YE*
BEFORE AND BE CONVERTED, that
your sins may be blotted out, WHEN THE TIMES
OF REFRESHING SHALL COME FROM THE
PRESENCE OF THE LORD ---- Our *Essayer*
 left out these Words [*ye therefore and be con-*
 where, you see the Apostle Places CON-
 ION also, before this *Blotting out of Sins*.
 therefore, 'Tis Evident that the *blotting out*
 must be such a *blotting out* as hath the
 Work of *Conversion* going before it; which
 hardly think Our *Essayer* Himself, if he
 Prejudice, will Maintain to be neces-
 to go before our *First Constitutive Justification*:
 he had quoted the Rest of the Text, it,

would have appeared obvious, even to the learned Reader, That, by the *blotting out* is meant the *Sentential Justification at the Day*, which is not the present Question: no Body refuseth, That *Repentance, Conversion and a whole Course of Holiness* must go before *Sentential blotting out of Sin*. But what is the purpose, as to the *Constitutive Justification* upon Faith's *First* recourse to Christ for Righteousness? 'Tis Evident the *Apostle* is here Speaking, not of that *Repentance*, which is a *Grace* distinct from *Faith*, but of the whole of *Reformation and a Holy Life*; 'Tis also plain, That *Speaks of blotting out of Sin* when the *Time of Refreshing* shall come from the presence of the Lord. And the Verses following do Evidently clear what he Means by these *Times of Refreshing*. V. 20. *And he shall send Jesus, which before Preached unto you, V. 21. whom the Heavens receive until the Times of the Restitution of all Things* --- Now this Meaning, is so obvious, That I see not how our *Essayer* will shift it, unless he'll even have Recourse to these *Quirks of Wit and Arts of Criticism*, which he so often Condemns. But, Good Mr. *Essayer*, why may it not be acknowledged and Proven too, That it is no less a *Capital Imposition* upon the *Unlearned Reader*, even the *Learned* too, if he happen to have a fond Opinion for an *Author*, as to swallow what he says without Examination, to *Curtail the Text*, that it may be shapen into the *Examination* of the *Gloss* one would impose on it, That he mis-interpret the Words themselves fairly, *but mis-understood*? I should Conclude for my Part, That the *Curtailer* is the Greatest Capital of the *Two*; because what may be Weakness of Judgment in the *Other*, is in him a wilful

GOSPE
ned Imp
his. Qu
e for y
Page, an
What I h
n long a
Divine
ification.
lays he
e mean
whereof
epentanc
Distinct
exegetic
VERTE
enote a
all their
racing
hereby,
her is th
ive Just
on, but
hereafter
shall con
his Secon

at our
take in
in to S
he must
throw for
tions c
Speaks
needs s
become
aning,
withou
31.
de

med Imposition. If you, Sir, had acted fairly
this Quotation, there would have been no
e for your Airy Triumph upon it, in this
Page, and again P. 31.

What I have said upon this Text, I find has
long ago advanced by an Eminent Ortho-
Divine of This Church, Mr. *J. Brown* on
ification, Chap. 29. P. 370. "REPENT
(says he) here (*viz.* in *Acts* iii. 19.) cannot
e meant of the Acting of That *Repentance*
whereof We are here speaking, *to wit*, of that
repentance which is a Peculiar, special Grace,
Distinct from *Faith*, and that because of the
Exegetical Term added AND BE CON-
VERTED, so that REPENT here, cannot
enote any Thing Else, but a Turning from
all their Sinful Opinions and Ways, and Em-
bracing the Gospel Way of Salvation, That,
hereby, they may be saved for ever. Nei-
ther is the Apostle speaking here, of *Constitu-
tive Justification*, or our *First* or *General Par-
don*, but, of a *Blotting out of Sins* a long Time
hereafter, *viz.* when the Times of Refreshing
shall come from the Presence of the Lord at
his *Second Coming*, as the following Verses shew,
----- Now, I am much of the Mind,
that our Essayer will either Acknowledge his
Stake in Perverting this Text; or, if he Try
in to Square it into the Gloss he has put on
he must e'en Use a little *Scholar-craft*, and
throw some *strain'd Criticisms*, and *Frivolous Di-
ctions* out of that Cart load of them whereof
Speaks P. 31. Unless, Perhaps, when he finds
needs *such Art* to make out his Sense of it;
become Jealous of it, that it is not the genuine
eaning, or that he may be safely Ignorant of
without Danger to his Soul, as he tells us
31.

As to what he adds P. 29. in his Appeal to the common understanding of Mankind, it to the Ground, together with the wrong Conclusion from whence he Infers it, and so I shall Dissent from it, only with this one Observation, That, were I to Digress so far, as to Examine His Way of speaking in that Paragraph, about *Demerits and Promises*, I fear, I should find it bordering much upon the *Neonomian Doctrine*, of the *new Law* being a new Preceptive Law with Sanction, which is but another Phrase for a Covenant of Works, tho' in Milder Terms. But I will not Digress on this.

His next Scripture P. 29. is *Acts v. 31.* where we are Told, That Christ is an exalted King and Saviour to give Repentance and Forgiveness of Sins. The whole of his Bantering Way of Reasoning from this Scripture, is taken from the Order in which these Benefits of Repentance and Remission of Sins are placed in the Sacred Record. Here we shall also take under our Consideration *Luke 24. 47.* [That Repentance and Remission of Sins should be Preach'd in his Name among all Nations] because he Reasons from it in the same Manner. Well, then, it seems, it is a received Rule of our *Essayer*, That the Order of Words in the Bible, is always the Order of Things themselves without this Supposition, his Reasonings are of no Purpose at all; and were it worth while, it could Expose it to the Conviction even of the Unlearned by a Multitude of Instances from Scripture, wherein the Order of Words must not be admitted as the Proper Order of Things themselves. But I shall go no further, to this Mouth on this Head, Than one of the Scriptures which he himself Quotes in this Place. *P. 30. viz. Isai. 55. 7.* Let the Wicked

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 55

IS WAY and the Unrighteous Man His THOUGHTS
 - Now, will the *Essayer*, from thence, Infer, That
 Wicked Man doth, and must forsake his *Evil*
Ways before he forsake his *Evil Thoughts*, and that
repentance must be first acted in the Life, before
 ere be a change in the *Heart*, because the
 Wicked Man's forsaking his *Way*, is placed before
 the Unrighteous Man's forsaking his *Thoughts*.
 At then as to These *Scriptures* themselves, I am
 much of the Opinion of that Eminent Man Mr.
John Brown upon Justification as to the Mean-
 ing thereof. " Chap. 29. P. 360 Par. 9. *Re-*
pentance (says he) sometimes includeth all
 that is required in Order to Salvation upon
 Mans part, or all that is required to Escape
Perishing, and thus it is to be understood, *Acts*
v. 31. So He --- I very much doubt if our *Es-*
sayer will be able to Disprove *This Gloss*; And,
 Repentance here, be taken in such a Com-
 prehensive Sense, so, also must *Remission of Sins*
 , as this same *Author* P. 371 affirms on the
 other Text *Luke 24. 47. Repentance here* (say-
 eth He) is to be understood of all that Duty
 which is called for in the Gospel, This being
 a short Sum of the whole Preaching of the
 Gospel; and therefor, by *Remission of Sins*, all
 the Blessings and Favours, That Sinners need,
 and are promised in the Gospel, must be un-
 derstood. So he. Now, all that can be infer-
 red from this is, That a Man is converted, made
 True Penitent, is renewed in Heart and Life,
 before he come to the full Enjoyment of the
 heavenly Inheritance, when Sin shall be done
 away, not only in its *Guilt* but in its *Being*. This
 comprehensive View appears to me to be the
 main meaning of These Texts: For in *Both* we
 have an Account of the *Doctrine*, which These
 Witnes-

Witnesses for Christ were to Preach unto the World; and 'tis not to be supposed that they were only to Preach the Duty of Repentance, taking it strictly as a Grace Distinct from Faith and other Graces; nor the Privilege of Remission, taking it alone as a Distinct Privilege by it self, but, That Faith, and other Graces, nay the whole Course and Practise of Holiness, are comprehended under the Term Repentance in these Places, and all the Privileges of the justified Person under the Term Remission of Sins. And, taking these Texts thus, as that *Judicious Divine Mr. Brown* doth, they do not at all prove the Precedency of True Gospel Repentance, as a Distinct Grace, unto Faith in Christ, laying hold on his Righteousness unto *Constitutive Justification and Union with Christ*. I might adduce other Eminent Divines and Interpreters, who take the Word Repentance in this Large Sense, when it is brought in as the Subject of the Preaching of the Gospel. So doth that Learned and justly valued Divine and Interpreter PAREUS in his *Comment: on Math: Chap: 3. v. 2.* folio P. 15. Summam predicationis Baptista verbo exponit μετανοεῖτε Resipiscite, Totam Conversionem præcipit, tum animorum et Cordum a vanis erroribus ad fidem Christi; Tum vitæ et morum, ab impietate et vitiis ad veram pietatem, quæ RESIPISCENTIA vocatur, cum PENITENTIA, proprie tamen fit Dolor ex errore et peccato admissio Conceptus. And downward, He expressly Teaches That Repentance flows from Faith. His Words are "Hinc, duo Habemus, I. veram Resipiscientiam non esse sine Fide, sed requirere Fidem in Christum, immo N. B. ex fide, tantumquam ex Radice pullulare, qui enim vult ad Deum

On
" D
" eo
" ti
" co
" pe
" C
" no
" R
" ni
" ho
" De
" nu
" cit
Essay
Hi
" Go
" ho
" scr
" esp
" Th
" xiii
" sak
" Re
" Sin
der w
conce
tance
fication
thor b
Point
said, f
Notio
givenes
Perish
he ult
for, a
the In

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 57

“ Deum accedere, hoc est, Resipiscere et ad Deum
“ converti, eum oportet credere, hoc est, de gra-
“ tia et Misericordia Dei in Christo. N. B. certo
“ *confidere*, secus Deum ut severum Judicem
“ peccator semper refugiet, quia Deus Ignis
“ Consumens est. II. Gratiam Dei priorem esse
“ nostra Resipiscentia ; proinde, non esse nostræ
“ Resipiscentiæ effectum, sed Causam ; non e-
“ nim Baptista dicit Penitentiam agite, quia
“ hoc modo deinde appropinquabit Regnum
“ Dei, sed priore loco Gratiam præponit, Reg-
“ num Gratia jam appropinquabit, ergo Resipis-
“ cite. But I proceed to the other Texts, Our
Essayer here Quotes.

His next is 1 Jo. 1. 9. “ *If we Confess our Sins,*
“ *God is Just and Faithful to Forgive us our Sins.* I
“ hope then (says he) *Repentance* which is here de-
“ scribed by *Confessing* is necessary to Pardon,
“ especially, when we are Peremptorly told,
“ That except we Repent we shall Perish, Luke
“ xiii. 3. And that He who confesseth and for-
“ saketh his Sins shall find Mercy, Prov. 28. 13.
“ Repent and be baptized for the Remission of
“ Sins, Acts ii. 38. Now, Sir, when I consi-
der what is really the Question in Debate, viz.
concerning the Priority of True Gospel Repen-
tance unto Faith, and our *first Constitutive Justi-*
fication, I cannot help concluding that our Au-
thor by adducing these Texts is quite off the
Point, mistakes the Question, and I had almost
said, seems to fall into a Jumble of Incoherent
Notions. 'Tis plain here, that he makes *For-*
giveness of Sins and Eternal Salvation, or not
Perishing Equivalent Terms, and indeed, I find
he uses them Promiscuously in this Question ;
for, after he had quoted 1 Jo. 1. 9. To confirm
the Inference he draws from it, he quotes Luke

13. 3. and *Prov.* 28. 13. and *Acts* 2. 38. with an ESPECIALLY, whereby he introduceth them as *Explicatory* and *Confirmatory* of the former Quotation, 1 *Jo.* 1. 9. So then, *Forgiveness of Sins*, 1 *Jo.* 1. 9. and *Remission of Sins*, *Acts* 2. 38. are the same Thing with *not Perishing*, *Luke* 13. 3. and *finding Mercy*, *Prov.* 28. 13. Now, This I take notice of here, not because I think otherwise (for I am indeed of Opinion that they are all the same Thing in these Places, and that they are to be understood of Compleat Salvation in Heaven) But I observe it, because, according to this True Acceptation of these Phrases, These Quotations do not at all serve our Author's Purpose. They Prove not what is in Question, for we do not Refuse that Confession of Sin, Repentance and forsaking of it are Antecedent unto *finding Mercy at the Day of the Lord*, and *escaping of Perishing*, and so unto *Remission* and *Forgiveness* in that Sense.

But to make this Matter more clear, let us a little Consider these Scriptures themselves. That Text 1 *John* 1. 9. *If we confess our Sins, God is just and Faithful to forgive us our Sins*, is plainly to be understood of the Godly, of whom he Speaks in the Context, and so of those who are already in a justified state. Who had Communion with God, and who were cleansed from their Sins by the Blood of Jesus; The Apostle tells such, that tho' they were in this happy State, yet they were not without Sin, and by way of Supposition, he Argues, That if they should say they had no Sin they should Deceive themselves. And then if we Confess our Sins &c. Now the Confession here, being, That of a justified Person, it is a Confession that proceeds from Faith's Views of a reconciled God in the
Face

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 59

Face of Christ, like that of the Prodigal, after the Father had received him into his Embraces; And Consequently, the *Forgiveness of Sins* cannot be understood of the *First General Constitutive Pardon*, by which a Person is brought into a justified State, but *Such after Pardon* as is Consistent with that Unalterable and Permanent State of Justification; And so, must be understood of the removing of the Tokens of Fatherly Displeasure, (and not the taking off His Vindictive Wrath, which is done compleatly in the Constitutive Justification.) Or the Intimation of their Pardon, the restoring unto them the Joy of God's Salvation, which may be interrupted by their Sins, till they come to a Penitent Confession thereof; or, it may be understood of the Sentential Pardon, at the great Day. However, being justified Persons of whom he speaks, it can't be understood of the *First Constitutive Pardon*, whereof they were possessed, and which they could never fall from. Indeed, I acknowledge that in bringing in a Sinner unto a justified State, he is brought to Confess and acknowledge his Sins, but then I Maintain that all that Confession of Sins which goes before Faith and Justification is not from a True Evangelical Frame and Disposition of Soul, but is the Fruit of the Spirit of Bondage, and that a Person never comes to a True Sense of Sin, or a true Penitent Confession of it till he get Faith's Views of, that Blood that cleanseth from all Sins. I think then this Scripture 1 Jo. 1. 9. will not serve our Essayer's purpose.

And, he will find as little help from the next. *Luke XIII. 3.* Except we Repent we shall perish. It being Evident that *Repentance*, in that Place, includes the whole of *Reformation*, and that

that *not perishing*, is to be understood of our *Compleat Salvation in Heaven*. 'Tis, indeed a certain Truth, That they who Perish do come short of the Forgiveness of their Sins, and that the Finally Impenitent shall perish, and that in this Text there's an inseparable Connection betwixt Impenitency and Eternal Ruin; But, what is all this to the present Question, concerning the *Priority of True Evangelical Repentance unto True saving Faith* and our *Constitutive Justification*? When we assert, That God brings the Sinner unto this true Gospel Repentance, and, unto true Gospel new Obedience, *these Fruits meet for Repentance*; by giving them Faith's Views of a Redeemer, and drawing out their Souls to receive and apply his Righteousness, and thereby justifying and Uniting them to Christ; and, That from thence true Repentance and Reformation Flows, we do no less Maintain the Necessity of Repentance to escape Perishing, than our Author can pretend to do; Only we Maintain the true Method of Grace according to the very Nature and Spirit of the Gospel, which Flees in the Face of the Supposition of any Kind of true and Evangelical Obedience, or Good Works, whether done by us or wrought in us, antecedent unto our Union with, and Marriage unto Christ, which is made up by Faith, not as a Work, but as an Instrument. Till then, we bring forth no Fruit unto God, Till then we are not in the Vine, and so CANNOT bring forth Fruit; Till then, we are the Corrupt Tree, Remaining in the old Stock as *Adam's Degenerate Race*; And, till we be Transplanted and Ingrafted into Christ the second *Adam*, and the true Vine our Repentance, or other good Works cannot be called true Evangelical Works of Holiness.

What

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 61

What I have said on *Luke* 13. 3. May be applied to the next Scripture quoted, *viz.* *Prov.* 28. 13. He who confesseth and forsaketh his Sins shall find Mercy. Only it may be considered, That when he speaks of *FORSAKING* as well as *Confessing* Sins, he plainly understands Reformatioun of Life, but how this can be before saving *Faith*, and our Union with Christ and our Constitutive Justification, I see not. Indeed a Man may thro' the Force of a Legal Conviction be scarred from the Practice of these Gross Enormities of Life, he hath formerly been involved in; But, I Hope, our *Essayer* will not think this all that is included in a *TRUE* forsaking of Sin; Nevertheless, till a Man have that *Faith* that *Worketh by Love, purifieth the Heart, and overcometh the World*, he will never *OTHERWAYS*, Forsake Sin. And so, Then finding Mercy cannot be understood of the *First Constitutive Justification*. I find Mr. *Brown* understands it of Felicity here, and hereafter, and that, in Opposition to not prospering, mentioned in the First part of the Verse, *vid.* *Brown* on Justification Chap. 29. P. 372. And I think his Gloss, true and solid.

Our *Author's* next Quotation is *Acts* II. 38. *Repent and be Baptized for the Remission of Sins*. But how little this will be to his purpose may be Evident, if we consider, That, if *Repentance* in this Text be understood as a *Grace distinct from Faith*, Then, it would appear to exclude *Faith* from its Interest in Remission of Sins. As also, *Baptism* will be made no less necessary, in Order to Pardon, than *Repentance*. I am much of Mr. *Brown's* Mind concerning the Meaning of this Text. Who says, "The true meaning of *Act.* 2. 38, is [Turn from your former Way of seeking Salvation by your own Corrupt Imaginations

" tions and Superstitions, which led you, out
 " of Blind Zeal, to Crucify the Lord Christ;
 " and Embrace the Gospel of Salvation, now
 " preached unto you, through the Lord whom
 " ye Crucified, that ye may Receive Remission
 " of Sins through Faith in him. *Brown on Justi-*
 " *fication Chap. 29. P. 370.*] And indeed I
 find when the Term *Repentance* is join'd with
Baptism, it is plainly to be meant of *Faith* it self,
 whereby, that Gracious Change is introduced
 which Terminats in *Repentance* taken for *Refor-*
mation or a Holy Life, as is Evident from *Paul's*
Commentary on John's Baptism of Repentance, Acts
19. 4. Then said Paul, John verily Baptized with
the Baptism of Repentance. Saying unto the People,
N. B. That they should believe on Him who should
come after him, that is on Christ Jesus. Where 'tis
 plain That when *Repentance* is placed alone before
Baptism, it must be understood of *Faith*; for so
Paul explains it in this Place. And again tho'
Baptism is placed before *Remission* of Sins, accord-
 ing to the *Order of Words*, its not to be under-
 stood as necessarily going before it according to
 the *Order of Existence*; so says the Judicious *Calvin*
 on this Text, *A&. II. 38. " Tametsi, in Con-*
 " *textu verborum, Baptismus Remissionem pec-*
 " *catorum hic præcedit, N. B. Ordine tamen se-*
 " *quitur, quia nihil aliud est quam bonorum,*
 " *quæ per Christum Consequimur, obsignatio,*
 " *ut in Conscientiis nostris recta sint.* Our *Es-*
sayer, then, obtains nothing to prove his Point
 from this Text. The next, mentioned *viz.*
Luke 24. 47. hath been considered before. But,

We must take Particular Notice of the *Follow-*
ing viz. Isai. LV. 7. Let the Wicked forsake his
Way, and the unrighteous Man his Thoughts, and turn
to the Lord and he will have Mercy, and to our God, for

he

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 63
he will abundantly Pardon. Because, Tho' our *Essayer* doth but barely Mention it; Yet, Some, on this Head, do boast of it as unanswerable. So doth Principal *Hadow* Ant. Detect. P. 53. And now, Sir, I will beg your Pardon, to make a *Digression* (which I hope will not be altogether unprofitable) to consider what this *Eminent Champion* hath advanced, as the *Meaning* and *Scope* of this Text.

The Principal. [*Ant. Detect. P. 53.*] hath these Words. " Repentance, or forsaking of Sin, " hath the Promise of Pardon annexed unto it, & " the Duty is enforced from the encouraging " Promise of this Gracious Benefite, following " thereon, *Isai. LV. 7. Let the Wicked forsake his Way* &c. This Divine Oracle (says he) " doth look, the *Antinomian Error* out of Countenance, and will stand its Ground against all " Opposition.

The *Pr.* it seems, takes it for granted, that it is an *Antinomian Error* to Maintain, That JUSTIFICATION and PARDON goeth before True Evangelical REPENTANCE; But, how does he make this Good? Indeed we are told That *Antinomians* Maintain, That Repentance is a Legal Duty and Exercise, and, That it is not to be performed by BELIEVERS, because they are not under the Law; And, this Error we Heartily Condemn: But, I cannot find that what they Maintain concerning the Priority of Justification unto Repentance is accounted one of their Errors. Mr. *Rutherford* who made a very narrow Enquiry into their Errors in his *Survey of Antinomianism*, and, who frequently takes notice of them in his other Writtings, never Charges them with This as an Error: Nay, so far from this, that in his *Christ Dying* and drawing P. 593. and 594. He Maintains

Maintains what our *Essayer* and his Patron P. *Hadow* calls *Error*, and an *Antinomian Error*, to be *Gospel Truths*. He is speaking of the Believer's Deliverance 1. from the *Guilt* of Sin, or our *Obligation to Eternal Wrath*, and all the *Punishments* of Sin, according to the Order of Justice by the Law of God, and of the *Blot of Internal Guilt* of Sin, by which Sin Dwelleth in us by Nature. P. 593. And then, with Respect to these He says " P. 594. In Regard of the *Former*, Faith " in Christ is N. B. The ONLY MEANS and " Way to get out of our Bondage and Misery ; " in Regard of the *Latter*, Repentance and the " whole Trace of our new Obedience, are the " Means to Escape out of this Misery, nor do we " N. B. make, Acts of Sanctification Compart- " ners and joint Causes and Conditions in " the Work of Justification --- But, Repentance " and new Obedience are Means, tending to our " escaping out of the *Latter Bondage* --- For " (says he a little downward) to *Repent* and " Love the Brethren, to obey our Parents, as " looking thereby for Remission of Sins, would " be unlawful and a falling from Christ: But, " in the Matter of *Sanctification* and of Testify- " ing our *Thankfulness* to Christ for the Work of " Redemption, they are not unlawful, but com- " manded as necessary Duties. Whence it is Evident Mr. *Rutherford* places nothing before Justification but *Faith*, for he calls it the ONLY MEAN, and WAY, to get from under the *Guilt* of Sin, or *Obligation to Eternal Wrath*: He excludes all Acts of *Sanctification*, as Copartners or joint Causes and Conditions, in the Work of *Justification*. He assigns another, and, indeed the proper Place to *Repentance*, and *New Obedience*, and expressly tells us, we are not to look for

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 75

or Remission of Sins thereby. So far is this eminent Man, who, in his Day, Honourably held Pr. *Hadow's* Chair, from the Opinion of his successor.

But now, let us Trace the *Principal* in his *Gloss* on *Isai. LV. 7.* [*Ant. Det. P. 53*] " In the Beginning (says he) of this Chapter, the Mercat of Free Grace is opened with a Call to every one that Thirsteth to come, *without Money and without Price*, and in v. 7. the Offer of Mercy is extended to the *Wicked and Unrighteous*, But, That the Doctrine of Grace might not be reproached, as if it gave any Encouragement to Impenitent Sinners, to expect Pardon, the Wicked are required to forsake their Way, else they come not within the Compass of this Gospel Promise of Pardoning Mercy.

DECLAIMED LIKE A DOCTOR INDEED!

and Consistent with himself too in that *Famous Sentence* in his *Synodical Sermon* on 1 Jo. 5. 11. P. 1. viz. [*And as to the Conditional Promise (He that Believeth shall be saved) N. B. it is made Believers only Exclusively of others*] a Sentence, which, in *The Scope and Substance of the Marrow* 28 &c. is sufficiently exposed, as both *Error and Nonsense*. In short, the *Principal*, will, it seems, save Persons *Whole*, before they come to the Physician, and *clean* before they come to the Fountain. He'll have none but *True Penitents and Believers*, invited to come to the Mercat of Free Grace. But, with your leave, R. Sir, why come without any Money at all, and seek remittance it self from the *Glorious Prince*, who is pleased to give it? The *Principal* proceeds, and says us " 'Tis Evident 1. That the Wicked Man's forsaking his Way, and the Unrighteous Man his Thoughts, and his returning unto the Lord go before his obtaining the Pardon

“ of his Sins. 2. That this forsaking and
 “ turning, are not Acts of Man's Free Will, P
 “ duced by his own Natural Powers, a m
 “ Law Work; but they are Fruits of the
 “ newing Spirit, and actings of the new C
 “ ture, They are even *Repentance unto Life*, see
 “ they have by Divine Promise, Pardon
 “ Mercy annexed unto them.

I would here ask This R. Doctor, Is
Forsaking and Returning, and this *Repentance*
Life, A good Work? This I suppose He
 Grant; because, He says, they are -- actings of
 new Creature: But then, let me ask
 whither the Promises connected with g
 Works are not *First & Primarily* to be underst
 as made to the *Person*, who is accepted fr
 and without Consideration of them, and t
 to the Work? Had not GOD first a respect
 Abel, and then to his Offering? If so, Then
 Promise made to such good Works as these
Repentance and forsaking of Sin must presup
 the Person to be accepted. And so a Belie
 and a justified Person. And so, he must be
 Believer and a justified Person, before he c
 in *An Evangelical Way*, Forsake his Sin and ret
 unto the Lord by *Repentance*. I ask the R
 Whether, True *Repentance*, can be called
 Thing else but a good Work? Sure, it can
 be called an *Instrument* of Justification, as *Faith*
 This all Orthodox Divines own, That *Faith*
 the *Alone Instrument* of Justification; This
 Church Maintains, as every Child will tell
 P. who can Repeat the Answer to Q. *What*
Justification? Now, If so, Then *Repentance*
 going before Justification can have no Causa
 or Relation unto it, but as a *Good Work*. N
 let us Hear, what *Our Church says* of all

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 67
Confess. Chap. 16. §. 2. *Good Works done*
Obedience to God's Commandments are N. B. the
PROOFS and Evidences of a True and Lively
Faith. If Repentance then be a *Good Work* done
Obedience to God's Command, I think it is
Faith in Order of Nature, at least, unless
P. and the *Essayer* will Maintain, that the
is before the Tree, and the *Evidence* be-
the Thing whereof it is an Evidence. But
aps, our R. *Principal* will alledge, that it is
the priority of Repentance to *Faith*, but to
son, that he Maintains. I know some alledge
for him. But it is a very Foolish pretence;
[Ant. Det. P. 50.] Tho' the Principal
ends this not to be the precise Question, yet
gives some Reasons for the priority of Repen-
tance to *Faith*, taken from its being first placed
in our Larger Catechism, and in several
Scriptures; and what ever be in it self, it must be
an efficient Document of the P's. Opinion, that
Repentance is before *Faith*, seeing he Argues from
the very same Topick concerning the Priority
of Repentance unto Forgiveness P. 51. And in-
deed, if the Argument be good the one Way,
no less Cogent the other. But waving futher
Review this at the Time, our *Confess.* puts this
matter beyond Debate in the above cited Chap.
§. 6. wherein we are Taught that *The Per-*
son of Believers being accepted through Christ, Their
Good Works also are accepted in him. Now
is inevitable, that the P. must *Either* deny
Repentance unto Life, forsaking of Sin and
Coming unto the Lord, to be a *good Work*; (But
we can't think he will do, seeing he owns
it to be a Fruit of the renewing Spirit, and an
Effect of the new Creature and hath the Promise
of Pardon annexed to it;) OR he must own,
That

That a Person must be a *justified Person*, a *Believer*, before He can perform this good *VVork*. Or he must say, that a Person can be accepted of Christ, and yet, not be a *Justified Person*; Or must e'en turn a little *Cool* upon that *Paragon* of our *Confess.* That *Maintains*, That the *Person* must be accepted, before their *Good VVork* can be accepted. Or, Finally he must borrow some *Quirks* of *VVit*, some *Strain'd Criticisms* and *lastick niceties*, and *Friivolous Distinctions*, out of a *Cart Load* of them, whereof our *Essayer* Spackled P. 31. For I know nothing else can *Help* out at a *Dead lift*, in this *Point*, at least perhaps these may keep his *Countenance* a little, with *Admirers*, and preserve the *Character* he has got among them of being a *GREAT MAN*. *DEEP REACH*, a *PROFOUND SCHOLAR* and *One* whom 'tis *almost Criminal*, as well *Foolish* to offer to *Confute*.

As to the *second Thing* which the *P.* says *Evident*, viz. *That this Forsaking and Return are not Acts of Man's free Will but Fruits of the newing Spirit*, ---- &c. *I am*, indeed, of his *Mind*, That this is a *Truth* it self, and *Evident* enough from other *Scriptures*; but, without the *Prophets*, *Thy* *pal's Spectacles*, I cannot see, how all this is *Evident* from this *Text*, *Isaiah LV. 7.* *They should even Stare, and Bite my Fingers* to find the *Paradox*.

But now, to go on with the *Principal*, P. 32. He thinks fit to *Step aside* a little to *Mother a Friend*, and to take notice of a *false Gloss* (which he thinks) of this *Text*, *Isai. 55. 7.* which he finds in a *Printed Sermon Preached by a Reverend Divine* at *DENNY Aug. 11 1718.*

The *P.* having told us, P. 54. That *Learned Divine's Gloss* Favoured both the *Arrian* and the *Auchterarder Position*, *Condemns* of the

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 69

the Assembly, viz. [That it is not Sound to
 b, That we must forsake Sin, in order to our
 ing to Christ, and instating us in Covenant
 God.] In his Sermon, P. 32 (says the P.
 .) He gives the Import of Isaiah 55. 7. *Let
 Wicked Man forsake his Way, and the Unrighteous
 his Thoughts,* (his Ways and Thoughts of
 ef) *And in Returning to the Lord, he will find
 y and Pardon.* " His Plain meaning then
 (says the R. P.) That, in this Text the
 Wicked and Unrighteous Man is not called
 forsake his Wicked Ways, and Evil
 thoughts; His Hatred and Contempt of God,
 his Envy and Malice against his Neighbour,
 his Abominable Lusts, and Wickedness of Life,
 Order to Forgiveness. But, only, to for-
 ke his own *Thoughts* and ways of *Relief*, such
 Trusting to his own Righteousness, for
 justification, and setting about Reformation,
 bring it as a Price in his Hand to Com-
 mend him to Christ: And if he forsake these
 ways of Relief, he shall obtain Mercy and
 Pardon, tho' he do not yet forsake his Sinful
 and Wicked Ways, --- and Downward, He
 says, This Gloss is contrived and advanced to
 conclude the Necessity of the Wicked Man's
 forsaking his Sins, in order to his obtaining
 the Pardon of Them.

Now R. Doctor, let me ask you Gravely,
 whether a Man may not injure a Text, or the
 meaning of any Author by *Subtraction* of some
 words and Phrases, that go in to make the Sen-
 se Compleat, and to set the true Sense there-
 in a clear Light, as well as by ADDITION
 unto, of a Word or Phrase, explicatory
 thereof? I shall by and by Consider what you
 say of the Addition, which you alledge the *Denny*
 Gloss

Gloss makes to the Text. *Isai. 55. 7.* But, my Time, let *Us* enquire a little into your *Substratum* of these Words from the *Denny Gloss* [*Returning to the Lord*] That Learned Divine says, not, If a Man forsake these Thoughts and *Way* of Relief, he shall obtain Mercy and Pardon, says, N. B. in *Returning to the Lord*, he shall find Mercy and Pardon. And, for my part, I know not how a Sinner can return unto the Lord, but in the *Way of Believing*, which is *Soul's coming to Christ*, as his City of Refuge. again R. Doctor, let me ask you, What do you mean by making such a Distinction between these Two, a Man's forsaking his false *Ways* of Thoughts of Relief, and his forsaking his *Ways*, and Thoughts? You seem to put a difference betwixt these Two, as if a Man's false *Ways* and Thoughts of Relief were to be classed among his *Wicked Ways* and Thoughts. But further R. Sir, you seem to suppose, That a Man, before he be Justified, can forsake his Hatred of God, his Enmity and Malice against his Neighbour, his Abominable Lusts and Wickedness of Life. *i. e.* If I take you right, he must Love God, and his Neighbour, with a true sincere Love, and so fulfil the whole Law, he must be a Holy Man, in Heart and Life, before he can be Reconciled to him, before he be a Just Person, he must be a *Godly Man* before he can be Justified *i. e. q. d. non Obstante*, that Paul has said, *Rom. 4. 5.* That God Justifies the *UN* GODLY, yet J. P. Hadow, say, it's only GODLY whom God Justifys.

But now, we must follow the R. P. in his *Observations* which he offers for Vindicating the Text from the *Denny Gloss*, and for confirming the Truth proposed. The 1. *Observation*

in GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 71

That the Author of the Gloss makes an *Addition* to the *Text* without any Ground, or Countenance from the Words. The Text Speaks of the Wicked and Unrighteous Man's *Ways* and *Thoughts*, and he adds. [**OF RELIEF**] and, if such like *Additions* were allowed, The Holy Scripture would be turned into a *Nose of Wax*, to be pilyed to every one's Fancy.

But now, Sir, is there the least *shadow* of a Ground for what you here Advance? Is there any Thing here, but an Expression, *Explaining* what is contained in the Text? If the P. pretend, that this is an *Addition* to the Text, I see not but he must discard *all Commentaries* on Scripture. Neither is the *Denny Gloss* Singular. The P. himself owns that, Acts 11. 38 is Parallel to Mai. LV. 7. Now, I find, *Mr. Brown* on Justification. Chap. 29. P. 370. Explaining *that Text* the same Way. "*Repent for the Remission of Sins*, --- He says, The true Meaning of the Place is, turn from your former Way of seeking Salvation, by your own Corrupt Imaginations, and Superstitions, and embrace the Gospel Way of Salvation. And, what is this but to turn from vain Thoughts, and Ways of Relief?

The P's *Second Observation*, is no less out of the way than the *First*. Speaking of the former *Denny Gloss*, He says. P. 55. That, it is not agreeable to the simple and Genuine Meaning of the Words, as used in *Scriptures*. And, to confirm this, he Labours hard to prove *what no Body Denys* That, by the Wicked Man's Ways and Thoughts are to be understood *Wicked Ways* and *Wicked Thoughts*. Now this is granted to the R. Doctor. But what will he make of it?

Truely,

Truely, he infers very Learnedly, that seeing *Ways and Thoughts* here, are meant *Wicked Ways and Thoughts*, it can't be understood of ways of *Relief*. But, why so, Good Sir, are not the *Thoughts and ways of Relief*, which *Carnal Men* contrive and rely upon, *Wicked Ways and Thoughts*? Is it not a Dreadful Wickedness to reject Christ, to refuse him that speaketh from Heaven? Are they not *Wicked Thoughts* that lead Men to Build on their own Righteousness and to go about to establish it, and to refuse to submit to the Righteousness of Christ? Now if such *Thoughts and Ways of Relief* are, *Wicked Ways and Thoughts*, there's no Force in this 2d Observation.

And, The Pr. *Third Observation*, P. 57. will be found to be to as little Purpose. "This Gloss (says he) is not agreeable unto the Scope and Context; For, the Invitation v. 1. to come *without Money and without Price*, doth Import That the Man must lay aside all Conceit and Confidence in his own Righteousness; I allow grant (says he) that the *Expostulation* Verse 2. *wherefore do ye Spend your Money, &c.* may Comprehend God's rejecting their *Thoughts and Ways of Relief* --- Very well. So far we are agreed, --- But still the *Principal* hath a KNACK whereby to keep this Gloss from Travelling to the End of the Chapter. For, he tells us with *Profound Learning* (for it seems he's well seen in the *Jewish Antiquities*.) "That, the Exhortation in the *First four Verses*, is directed to the *Jews*, a People who went about to establish their own Righteousness. Rom. X. 2. But in V. 5. There's a Prediction of the bringing in of the Gentiles, *Behold thou shalt call a Nation that thou knewest not, &c.* and the

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 73

" call is extended unto them, V. 6. 7. What Call, Pray R. Sir, is extended unto Them? Is it the same Call the *Jews* got in the First four Verses? If so, Then are not they as well as the *Jews* called from their Vain Thoughts and Ways of Relief? "No says, the P. for he tells us, "*The Wicked and Unrighteous are the Gentiles*, which followed not after Righteousness, Rom. 9. 39. "and so, (says he) the Thoughts and Ways they are called to forsake are N. B. NOT "**THOSE OF RELIEF**, which (says he) N. B. *They sought not after*, but their Wicked and Unrighteous Ways which they were Pursuing when they knew not God. ---- EX-
" **CELLENT!**

But now, If I might borrow a FINE PHRASE from the ESSAYER P. 31. I would almost say, that *It would raise Indignation in a very Cool and Calm Temper to find Scripture and Sense both, Miserably affronted by such Profound Blunders*, I had almost said IGNORANCE, were it not that I have to do with one, who is reputed such a very *Learn'd Rabbi*. Of whose Deep Reach, in Interpreting Scripture, take another Swatch in the following Words, "Moreover, (says he) this Gloss, restricts the Call to those who set up for their own ways of Relief, to *the Exclusion of the Gentiles and those Wicked*. "N. B. *who seek not after Relief*, and, unless such come most properly under the Designation of "*[Rasbang, and Ish-aven] Wicked and Unrighteous or Men of Iniquity*, shall we think that they are not Comprehended in this Call, so expressly directed unto them?

Now, The whole of the *Principal's* Reasonings in this 3d *Observation* are founded on these Things:

1. That the Exhortations in the *first four* Verses are directed to *The Jews* only.

2. That

2. That the *Wicked* and *Unrighteous* V. 7. are the Gentiles only.

That these Gentiles sought not after Ways of Relief, and so, their Thoughts and Ways can't be meant of *These*, but of their Wicked and Unrighteous Ways and Thoughts.

4. That the *Denny* Gloss excludes the *Gentiles* and those Wicked who seek not after Relief. And,

5. That the Gentiles come most properly under the Designation of [*Rasbang and Ish-ayen.*]

Now let us consider these Things.

As to the 1. We Refuse not the Exhortation in the *first four Verses* is directed to the *Jews*, but we see no Ground to think it is *restricted* to them. The *R. P.* owns P. 55. That in the beginning of the Chap. The Mercat of free Grace is offered with a Call to *every one* that thirsteth, to come without Money and without Price. But now, is this Mercat of free Grace only offered to the *Jews*? God forbid. Now, if the *Gentiles* be comprehended in the Exhortation in the first four Verses, before mention is made of the Prediction of the calling of the *Gentiles*, why may we not conclude,

As to the 2d Thing I noticed, *That the Wicked and Unrighteous, mentioned v. 7. are not the GENTILES ONLY, but also THE JEWS?* I cannot, by all the Application of Thought I am Master of, conceive, why *Jews* and *Gentiles both*, are not comprehended in the Exhortation both in the first four V's and in V. 6. and 7. The P. will have the *first four V's* which (says he) are directed to the *Jews* to be an Invitation to come without Money and without Price to the Mercat of free Grace, and what else is this but Faith? And he'll have V. 7. which he says be-

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 75

belongs to the Gentiles to be meant of *Repentance*. Is this, then, the P's NEW SCHEME, That the *Jews* were called to *Faith*, and not to *Repentance*? and the *Gentiles* to *Repentance*, and not to *Faith*? or That the *Jews* are called *first* to *Believe*, and then to *Repent*? and the *Gentiles* *first* to *Repent* and then to *Believe*? If this, or something a kin to it be not his meaning, I can't understand to what Purpose he applies the giving of the Mercat of free Grace to the *Jews*, and the Call to Repentance unto the *Gentiles*. Nay, I am perswaded all these Gracious Calls belong to Both.

But then, as to the 3d Thing I noticed, viz. That the P. Maintains, That the *Gentiles* Sought not after Ways of Relief; and so, the Ways and Thoughts of Relief are not here to be understood. PITIFULL! --- Does the P. own that the *Gentiles* had a Law Written in their Hearts? Does he own that their Consciences sometimes accused them for counteracting their Light? These Things he cannot Refuse unless he Contradict the *Apostle's* Account of them. *Rom. 2. 14.* Well, then, does he say that under Challenges, they had no Apprehensions of an Angry Diety? And will the P. in good Earnest say, That the *Gentiles* had no vain Thoughts of Relief, no Thoughts and Ways of appeasing (as they imagined) Their Gods? I cannot think he will adhere to this, he must even find some other *Quirk*, for this will do him no Service. Is it not very well known to every *Smatterer*, either in *History* or *Divinity*, That the *Gentiles*, as well as the *Jews*, had Vain Thoughts and Ways of Relief? What were their *Sacrifices*, but such? And will the P. say that all their *Sacrifices* were Eucharistical? And if he own that they designed any of their *Sacrifices* for Expiation

tion, also; he must Confess that they had Vain Thoughts and Ways of Relief. Did they not Devise many foolish Wayes of Relief? The R. Mr. Haliburton late Collegue with this great P. tells us in his Book against *Deism* P. 126. 127, 128. That many of the *Gentiles* under convictions of Sin had Recourse to *Philosophy, Musick, and Mathematicks, and Diverse Washings, Sacrifices, and these sometimes of Men.* And are these no Vain Thoughts of Relief? I hope the R. P. will not hold by this Assertion any longer, That the GENTILES *Sought not after Ways of Relief.* And I hope likewise he will grant, that seeing they did, then the Text *Isai. 55. 7.* May be interpreted of these Wicked Ways of Relief. And I hope he will likewise see, that what we noticed,

In the 4. Place, as his Opinion, *viz.* That the *Denny Gloss* excludes the *Gentiles* and those Wicked, who seek not after Relief, is Groundless; for it is evident both *Jews* and *Gentiles* did seek after Vain Ways of Relief, and so the *Gloss* includes them both, and excludes neither of them. And consequently I hope he will also own,

As to the 5. Thing I noticed, *viz.* That he Thinks the *Gentiles* came most Properly under the Designation of [*Rasbang* and *Ish-aven*] That there is no solid Ground for that Observation, these Terms being abundantly Applicable unto Wicked Persons, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, and perhaps, more Especially to the JEWS, considering Their Privileges and the Abuse of 'em.

The Ps. 4th Observation P. 58. is, " That by
 " this Gloss a Sinner may obtain Pardon while
 " he is yet Impenitent, and return to the Lord,
 " without turning from Sin; for it makes the
 " Term from which he turns, to be, not his Sins
 and

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 77

“ and Gross Abominations, but his Ways and
“ Thoughts of Relief, and if he forsake *These*,
“ tho’ he forsake not his Wicked Ways, tho’ he
“ Repent not of his Iniquous Thoughts, tho’
“ he hath no true Sorrow, and Grief of Heart,
“ for his God Provoking and Dishonouring
“ Sins, yet our God will abundantly Pardon
“ him. Which is so Gross, that I hope its *Author* will not own it.

Here, let us consider, That the *Denny Gloss* doth not separate the parts of the Text and say, only, *That a Man who turns from his own way and Thoughts of Relief shall be Pardoned; Tho’ he turn not to the Lord; But what he says, is, That the Man who forsakes his Thoughts and Ways of Relief, shall N. B. IN RETURNING TO THE LORD, find Mercy and Pardon.* And if the R. *Principal* had but allowed himself *Impartially* to consider this; and the Connection of the Passage, he would perhaps have spared his *Reflections*. For, the *Worthy Author*, speaking of *Coming to Christ* shews, that many being convinced of their Sin, do set about *Reformation*, that they may come to Christ, which (he says) is a *Preposterous* way, for (says he) it is evident from Rom. 6. 14. (which is his Text) That a Man must be in Christ, that he may study Holiness, and have the Victory over Sin. And foreseeing, that some would *Object*, That from this *Doctrine*, we are not, and need not part with Sin, in order to our closing with Christ, and may close with Christ and retain Idols too; He says that the Case is mistated; for the Question is not, *if a Man MAY Close with Christ and keep his Idols?* But, *If they CAN really part with them before they Embrace Christ, and by Faith derive vertue from him for that End?* This he denies, and says that the Scrip-
ture

ture seems also to Determine against it, and asserts, That *Faith* preceeds Sanctification and Holiness. Acts 15. 9. *Purifying the Heart by Faith*. Then (he says) " The Soul by the *ENLIGHTNING* " *CAST* of Grace sees it self, not only condemned, but depraved, and desperately VVicked, " and, That all its *ESSAYS* for Peace, and " growing better, are Ineffectual, it now sees " Christ made Righteousness and *Sanctification*, " for attaining of which, it Closes with him, " and this doth not say, They keep their Idols " when they do so, but, finding the Power of " Sin, *Over-match* for them, they Embrace him " as Gods *Remedy*, That they may be free'd " from *such an Enemy*; And so, it is a *Coming* " to him Labouring and heavie Laden with the " Sense of Guilt and VVickedness, That they " may have Relief, which (says he) I take to be the Import of Isaiah. 55. 7. And from all this, it is plain, That he understands the Duty exhorted unto, to be *Faith*, which is a wicked Man's forsaking his VVay, and an Unrighteous Man his Thoughts of Relief, and his returning to the Lord.

'Tis true, we may say, that the VVicked Man's *Way*, and the Unrighteous Man's *Thoughts* are the *Terminus a quo*, and the LORD is the *Terminus ad Quem*, and the *Motion it self*, *Faith*. VVhich, in respect of the *Terminus a Quo*, may be called *FORSAKING*; and in Respect of the *Terminus ad Quem*, *RETURNING*; yet we are not to Imagin, That *Forsaking* is ONE Act of *Faith*; and *returning* ANOTHER distinct from it, and *Posterior* to it: For, by that *same* Act of *Faith* whereby a Man Forsakes his VVay, and Thoughts of Relief, he doth Return unto the Lord for Relief. A Man, by one and the same Motion
Turning

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 79

Turning his back on the *West*, turns his Face to the *East*. I Hope then the Denny Gloss is yet safe.

The P.'s 5 *Observation* is " That the
" true meaning of the Text, which he hath
" given in Opposition to this *Gloss*, is confirmed
" from the parallel Passages, Acts II. 38. and III.
" 19. and *Isai.* 1. 16, 18. and *Prov.* 28. 13.
But having already considered *all these Texts*, except *Isai.* 1. 16, 17. I shall not now insist on them. And as to *Isai.* 1. 16, 17. It speaks plainly of *Actual Holiness* in both its Parts, and, to assert *Actual Holiness* to preceed *Justification* and *pardon* is contrary to *Scripture* and the Mind of all sound Orthodox Divines. and therefore nothing to the Purpose; But, What if these Texts be spoken to *Jews* as well as *Gentiles*, as I apprehend they are? If so, They are not (according to the P.) parallel to *Isai.* 55. 7. which, he says, is directed only to the *Gentiles* who are *most properly* called [*Rasbang* and *Isb-aven.*]

But, grant they are Parallel, it will, I hope, appear to the Impartial Reader, That the P. hath quite Mistaken the Meaning of 'em.

The P. goes on to some other of his *Proofs*, but, I shall not *Digress* further, to Trace him in this *Review* of our *Essayers* Book. What I have said on this Text, *Isai.* 55. 7. I have, in a great Measure, taken from a MANUSCRIPT CONFUTATION of the P.'s. *whole Book*, which hath not yet seen the *Light*, in which he is traced (more fully, than what this *Sample* Presents to the Reader) a *Capite ad Calcem*.

But now, I return to our *Essayer*. The last Scripture, he mentions to prove the Precedence of True *Evangelical* Repentance to Faith and Pardon P. 30. is *Ezek.* 18, 30. *Repent and Turn*
your

A REVIEW of an ESSAY,
your selves from all your Transgressions, so Iniquity shall not be your Ruin. Here he Mistakes the Question, which is not about what is *Previous unto Eternal Salvation*, or, The Escaping of Eeternal Ruin but, what is *Previous unto Justification*. I shall not think it worth my while to take notice of what follows P. 30. and 31. being compounded of **INVECTIVE** and **REPETITION**.

P. 32. He proceeds to his *Third Grand Topick*, viz. from our **STANDARD**. And Quotes chap. 15. §. 1. viz. *Repentance unto Life is an Evangelical Grace, the Doctrine whereof is to be preached by every MINISTER OF the Gospel, as well as that of Faith in Christ.* Now whatever *Antinomians* may say, can the **ESSAYER** have **BRASS** enough to alledge that these **OTHERS** whom he pretends to confute, did ever, in the least, impugne This? To what Purpose then is it here quoted? He next cites § 3. *Although Repentance be not to be rested in as any Satisfaction for Sin --- Yet, it is of such Necessity to all Sinners, That none may expect Pardon WITHOUT IT.*

But by what Rule of right Reasoning does the *Essayer* Infer the **PRECEDENCE** of *Repentance* from this, That a Sinner can't be pardoned **WITHOUT IT**? We own no Man is pardoned, but is, That Moment, a *Penitent*, and so, is not **WITHOUT IT**: But what is that to the **PRIORITY** of Nature, whereof he speaks? But I must grip our *Essayer* a little more close upon this *Quotation* from our **CONFESS**: The Scriptures adduced to Prove, That Repentance is no Cause of *Pardon*, appear to me Peremptorly to Determine the Precedence of *Faith* and *Pardon* to *Repentance*. Ezek. 36. 31. **THEN** shall ye Remember your own *Evil Ways*, &c. Now let us consider the Connection. It is, *after the Accomplish-*
ment

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 81

of the Promises in the preceeding Verses, the first
 hereof V. 25. is a Promise of the Removal
 the Guilt of Sin in Justification, by the Ap-
 plication of the Blood of Christ, which is that
 an *Water* sprinkled on the Conscience. To the
 me Purpose, is Ezek. 16. 61. *THEN* thou shalt
 remember thy *Ways* and be ashamed, &c. Now
THEN is this? It is, *When* God establisheth with
 m the Everlasting Covenant V. 60. i. e. when
 Faith, they are brought to take hold of it.
 and again, V. 62. I will Establish my Covenant
 th thee, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord.
 think here's Faith and a justifi'd State too. And
 en, follows the Fruit of it. V. 63. That thou
 yest Remember and be confounded, and never open
 Mouth any more because of thy Shame. --- Here's
 entance flowing from this Covenant State. And
 Confirm this, 'tis again added, *When I am pa-*
d toward thee, for all that thou hast done, saith the
Lord. Now, to borrow the Author's Phrase, Words
 not more plainly hold out the Precedence
 Faith, of Justification, of a Covenant and pardon-
 State, (wherein God is pacified towards the
 sinner, upon whom he has sprinkled the Blood of
 Christ) unto Repentance and other immediate and
 inseparable Fruits.
 But, further, 'tis Evident from the Scriptures
 cited by the Confess. That they do not at all
 intend to assert the Precedence of Repentance unto
 Constitutive Pardon in this Life, which is the
 Question in Debate, but unto Eternal Salvation
 Sentential Pardon at the last Day. The first
 Scripture is Luke 13. 3. *Except ye Repent ye shall*
likewise Perish. Now we have already made
 appear, That by *Perishing* here, is meant E-
 ternal Perishing in Hell, and that Repentance as well
 as Faith must go before our Escaping this, we

constantly affirm. The next Scripture cited in our *Confess.* is *Acts* 17. 30. *He commandeth all men every where to Repent.* Now does this speak of the Precedence of Repentance to Faith and our Constitutive Justification? No: It does, indeed, urge it, by the Consideration of the Day of Judgment. V. 31. *Because he hath appointed a Day in which he will Judge the World.*

Thus I have considered our Author's three General Topicks from Common Sense, Scripture, and our Standard, and, I hope The Impartial Reader will see how little, either of 'em do answer the Purpose. As to what follows P. 32. We will allow, That the *Confess.* speaks of Repentance in this Life, and not pretend to Escape its Force by a Distinction betwixt Legal and Gospel Repentance. And yet, I hope, I have made it appear, by comparing the Confession with the Scriptures quoted therein, that they are rather upon our Side of the Question.

He proceeds next, to some Quotations from Three Eminent Divines. Were I to Digress upon Quotations from Eminent Divines, I might do our Effayer Work enough upon this Subject. tho' Multitude of Quotations upon Faith and other Subjects, both from the Confessions of Churches and Writings of sound Divines have been offered upon some of our late Controversies, we feel little, some Men do regard These. And I believe our Author will not hold by all the Sentiments of these very Authors he Quotes, viz. *Durham, Hunchison* and *Owen* upon the Matters debated at this Day. As to *Durham*, I do acknowledge the Quotation from him appears pretty to his Purpose: Nevertheless several Things said in that Discourse, of Repentance which will mak one Think, That the Eminent Men did

olly dip into this Question, but did take *Pardon* in a more large Sense. 'Tis plain, That he says 153. That the Repentance which is *Previous* to the Exercise of *Faith* and *Pardon* of Sin is only *Legal Sorrow*, and a Common Work of the Spirit. And when he Speaks of True *Gospel-Repentance* as *Antecedent* to *Pardon*, all the Scriptures adduceth do relate to *Pardon* at the great Day, and to Eternal Salvation, and the escaping Ruin. But he hath not taken the Controversy under Consideration as it is now stated. Nor does what he says Favour the *Neonomian Scheme*, or the *Hypothesis* of our *Essayer* and his *Patron* the *pretended Detector* doth.

The Quotation from *Hutchison* joins *Faith* and *Repentance* together, and seems to import no other but That *Repentance*, which is in the Root and inlaid with *Faith*: Which says nothing to the question as stated betwixt us and the *Essayer*, but especially the *pretended Detector*, who makes the Exercise of the *GRACE* and *DUTY* of *Repentance* a *suspending Condition* of *Justification*; which in effect, a sort of a new *Covenant* of *WORKS* of a very strange & *Inconsistent Tenor*, viz. The making a *Promise* unto a *Duty*, which a *Man* must perform before he have *FAITH* in *Christ*, & *Justification* by the *Imputation* of his *Righteousness*, i. e. upon Performance of a *Duty* which he is to Perform before he have *Faith*, without which he cannot please God, and before he can have any *Access* to God. But, *F* and *Hutchison* on *Job* Chap. 42. 5, 6. Makes a sight of God (which is *Faith*) the Ground and Life of *Repentance*, and the Practice of *Repentance* resulting from this, which to me seems to make *Repentance* a *Fruit*, and not an *Antecedent* of *Justification*.

As to the Quotation from *Doctor Owen*, he

speaks only of that Repentance, which is *N. Radically* included in the Nature of *Faith*; (which the Question is not) and, in that *far* Quotation, he seems, plainly, to own that *Repentance*, which goes before *Faith*, is only *Leg* and is neither a *Disposition*, *Preparation*, nor *Con* *tion*, of our Justification.

What follows as to what our *Essayer* calls the Rise of Mistakes, from P. 33. to P. 37. I have considered 'em already in their proper Place, and shall add no more on this Subject. And, fearing I have tryed your Patience too much by the Length of this Letter, I shall now conclude,

Yours, &c.

LET. II

LETTER III.

SIR,

Without the Formality of *Introduction* to this Letter, I proceed to the next Head which, our *Essayer* says, is not *Legalism* P viz. *That a Believer is to Act FOR Life as well FROM Life.*

take no notice of his childish sporting about the Jingle of the Words *For & From*; But come presently to the Point. He owns a Believer is to Act *in* Life, & tells us, *very well*, That by his UNION with Jesus He is made *A Partaker of the Divine Nature* - But how now, Mr. *Essayer* --- How came you to Stumble into this Expression, *That by Union with Jesus we are made Partakers of the Divine Nature?* This, to me, is, indeed *SOUND*, and *WEET*; But I cannot see how it is Consistent with your Scheme about the precedence of such *Gospel Qualifications*, as *Repentance*, unto *Faith* and *Justification*, and Consequently Union with Christ. Say, Sir, hold here, and it will do much to bring us together in several Things now in Agitation. Well, but our *Essayer* will also have us Act *FOR* Life, as well as *From* Life. And indeed according to his Way of raking up that case, I shall have no Controversie with him; he seems in this Place, to mean no more than *EYEING* *Eternal Life*, as a *MOTIVE* and *encouragement* in a Patient Continuance in Well-doing. But then, *This* is not the Meaning of that Phrase --- in the *Preface to the 2d Part of MARROW*, and some *OTHER AUTHORS* whom, he pretends to *Confute*. *Preface to 2d Part of the*

the Marrow P. 14 §. IX. Says " The Believer
 " being united unto Christ, he becomes Dead
 " unto the Law, as a Covenant of Works, Christ
 " hath fulfilled both the DO, and the
 " DYE of that Covenant in his Room, and Stead
 " — And, from thence, he Infers, *That the Believer is not under the Command of Doing FOR Life*
 And, afterwards explains this DOING, and
 what can give no Tittle to Life. Whence it is
 Plain, he Means no more, but to assert *That the*
Believer's Obedience, NOW, comes not in Place of
Adam's Obedience, under a Covenant of Works, as
 a Federal Condition of Life. And that, this is
 his Meaning is plain from the Way it is intro-
 duced by his affirming, That Christ fulfilled the
 DO as well as the DIE of the Covenant of
 Works in his Room. And, again P. 18. Speak-
 ing of *Obedying as under a Covenant of Works*, he
 calls it an obeying FOR Life, in the Sense above
 explain'd: And again, using that same Phrase
 P. 32. He Calls a Reforming our Lives *By our own*
Endeavours before we may adventure to come to
 Christ for his Grace to Reform them, *A Legal*
Way of Doing FOR Life. And, is our *Essay*
 such a Stranger to the Native Bias of Carnal
 Minds? So unacquainted with the Common Way
 that Natural Men take, even when awakened
 by the Law, viz. To go about to establish their
 own Righteousness? Must we tell him, That
 nothing is more ordinary than for poor Sinners
 to Fall a *Doing FOR Life* in a Legal Way, and
 to expect Life FOR, or *because of their Doing*.
 It is this Way of Doing FOR Life that we Con-
 demn, and, not the *Eyeing of Eternal Life*, as
 an *Encouragement* to patient Continuance in
Well-doing. And, I cannot but think it very
 strange, *That the Essayer should have so industri-*

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 37

fully (as appears) concealed that *Author's* true meaning and Scope in his Use of these *Phrases*, and calm'd another upon him which his Words will not bear.

He proceeds next to an *Opinion*, which, he says, is near a Kin to the *Former*, and Harangues several Pages from P. 38. to P. 48. viz. *That the Believer must neither be moved with the Hopes of Heaven, or Fears of Hell, but serve God with a Pure and disinterested Love.*

Upon this our *Author* thinks fit to give a watch of his Parts, and tells us of *Mysticks* among *Heathens, Jews, Papists, and Protestants* especially *Antinomians*; 'Tis none of my Business to Trace him in these. I am none of those, who approve of *Romantick Divinity* more than he, and I know there has been abundance of *The* sort among all the *Denominations* he Mentions. But I can't but observe, How, in the Enumeration of what of this Kind he ascribes unto *Antinomians* (whose Errors I detest) he thinks fit to throw in some *Phrases* which, I apprehend, are designed to rub upon some *Authors*, or *Others*, who are sound and Orthodox, whom he would have posted up among a *Sett* of *Antinomian Mysticks*. And then, brings in the old *Threed-bare Cant*, That their Doctrine opens a Door to *Licentiousness*. But, Sir, with his good Leave, what some *Authors*, whom he appears to have in his View, do Maintain concerning the Nature of the Covenant of Grace, and of that *Faith* of God's Elect which takes hold of that Covenant, will be found to be the *Truths of God according to Godliness*, tho' I shall not *Tenaciously* stickle for every *Phrase*, whereby, some of 'em have expressed their Sentiments. These *Authors* are far from discarding the Law as an Almanack out of Date: Nor, do they

they reject the Use of *Promises* and *Threatnings* in *The Exercise of Practica^l Godliness*: And therefore if he did by his long Harangue on this Subject aim a blow at *these*, whom it appears he hath in View, and would fain Rank among *Antinomians*. He hath shot besides the *Mark*, and the Arrows being winged with the *Feathers* of *Prejudice* and *Calumny*, do return upon himself.

Nothing is more Evident than that there is a *Principle of self Preservation*, which God hath planted in us; And, that He deals with us in a Way agreeable unto our *Make* and *Frame*, and That Believers need both *Promises* and *Threatnings* to Work upon Them, and, that they do Work upon Them too, in a way suitable to Their State; But I can't say, I relish so very well The Way Our *Author* expresseth Himself upon this Head towards the foot of P. 41. wherein he seems to bring in the Law, Enforcing Obedience upon Believers by *Threatnings* in the same Manner, that it did *Adam* under the Covenant of Works. i. e. if I mistake him not, that the Believer is for his Non-obedience lyable unto Eternal Death. And, indeed, This, Our *Author*, afterwards directly Maintains, whereof we shall take notice in its Place. Only, mean Time I would have it observ'd, That there's such a great odds betwixt *Adam's* State, and that of Believers, that what was most agreeable in his State is inconsistent with their's. For, tho' the Law threatned Eternal Death on the least Failure yet he was not at the Time, a *Sinner*, and this was a most agreeable threatning, not only to prevent the Execution of Eternal Wrath, but even the being brought *Actually* under the Curse and a *Lyableness* thereunto; but Believers, being *Sinners*, whose Sins do indeed, in their own Nature

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 89

Nature, deserve Hell, if the Law Threatnings were directed unto them, in the *same Manner*, that they were unto Adam, they would, not only be lyable unto *Eternal Death*, but for the present, be under the Curse, which is the first immediat Effect of a Law Threatning on those, who are under the Law, as a *Covenant of Works*, and takes Place in Case of *Transgression*; and, which is indeed the State of *Unbelievers*, that the utmost Execution of that Curse is reserved till they come to Hell. This delay of the full Execution of that Wrath does not alter the Nature of their State. But all this is Inconsistent with the State of the *Believer*, for whom Christ was made a *Curse*, and who, by him is delivered from it, and who has received the Atonement, and so not only cannot be Finally condemned, but cannot for the present, be lyable thereunto, or under the *Curse*. I cheerfully acquiesce in the Doctrine of our *Confession* concerning *Law-threatnings*, with Respect to Believers. Chap. 19. § 6. --- --- The Threatnings of it, (viz. the Law) serve to shew, what even their Sins Deserve, and N. B. WHAT AFFLICTIONS IN THIS LIFE, they may expect for them, although freed from the Curse thereof. THREAT-NED in the Law --- Where, you see, that Law-Threatnings, with Respect to Believers, are no further applicable than to shew the Demerit of their Sins; and, have no further Effect than the Temporary Chastisements of a Father. And so, The Believer as such, is not bound to be afraid of being again brought under the *Curse*, which is the *First immediat Effect* of a *Law Threatning*, far less of *Hell*, which is the *Ultimat Execution* thereof; Yet they are of use, as our *Confess.* says, to let him see what his Sins Deserve. And I shall add, that tho' a Believer as such and under that

that Particulat View, *ought* not to be affraid that he shall go into Hell; because, considering and knowing himself to be in a *Justified State*, it would be utterly *Inconsistent* with *that State*, to believe that he is under the Curse, and lyable to Wrath; Nevertheless, a Person *who is* a Believer, not knowing that he is so, and especially being under awakening Convictions after Gross Enormities, *may be under fears of Hell*, which Fears may be *one way* of Gods Fatherly Chastisement; But, these Fears do not really alter their State, in it self; nor does it follow, That such Fears are *their Duty*; Nay, they are *partly Their Sin*, and partly *Their Punishment*, tho' not in *Wrath*, as Persons under the *Curse*. But more of this will occur afterwards. Our *Essayer* proceeds in this flowrishing Harangue to inculcate, what I'm perswaded these he pretends to Confute do not Refuse, *viz.* That Men, here on Earth, are moved by *Arguments* from Hope and Fear, and that this is suitable to our State on Earth. He justly quarrels such Refinements on Religion as would Destroy its Life and Vigour, and exposes the Folly of such *Refiners* upon pretence of more exalted Piety, whereby they impose upon the World, as the Founders of the several Orders among the *Papists* have done. He sets before us the Examples of Saints, both in the *Old* and *New Testament*, who had Respect to the *Recompence of Reward*, *Pressed towards the Mark*, and *looked at the Things which are not seen*: And thence, justly infers, That it is not *Mercenary* to Eye the Happiness that is to come. He justly Condemns *Corrupt Self-Love*, and very well explains that Principle of *self Preservation*, which is implanted in us, and *that sanctified Love to our Selves*, which the Scripture Commands, which cannot

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 91
cannot but Issue in a Regard to our *Happiness*
and *Welfare*.

These Things I do approve of in themselves, tho I can't help thinking, that by the Tenor of this Discourse, the Author Aims to cast a Reflection on some who don't deserve it. And, howsoever his Expressions run smoothly and agreeably enough; yet the *Hints* he gives, sometimes, may Tempt a Body to have some Fear, least there be some *Snake in the Grass*, even under a good many Expressions, otherways sound, considered abstractly in themselves. But I shall Trace this Subject no further here.

The next Species of *Legalism*, which, the *Essay*er tells us P. 48. he finds a certain *Author*, in the *Preface* to the 2d part of the *Marrow*, exclaiming against, is, *The preaching the Necessity of HOLINESS, as a Means ONLY in order to Eternal Life*.

The *Essay*er. here, gives but a very *Lame* Account of what the *Preface* says on this Subject. The *Preface* P. 33. speaks of commending *Holiness* as the *Chief* part of *our Salvation*, and so, as an *END* to be aimed at, with the utmost Care, under this View (seeing *Glory* in *Heaven* lyes in the *Perfection* thereof) and not *merely*, as a *Mean* to obtain *Salvation*; and then, adds. *This last Way of conceiving it hath a native Tendency to put Men upon the Way of Doing FOR Life and not Doing FROM Life, and so, leads them into a VWay of seeking Salvation, according to a Covenant of VWorks*. And again, P. 38. He says, " That *The Evangelical Preacher of Holiness recommends it* " *not, MERELY as a VWAY, in Order to the obtain-* " *ing of Eternal Life, but as the BEGUN SAL-* " *VATION of the Believer IN TIME, He sets* " *forth its native Beauty, as a Conformity to the* " *Divine*

" Divine Law, which is the Transcript of the
 " Holiness of His Nature, He sets forth the A-
 " bominable Nature of Sin, as exceeding Sinful in
 " it self, as well as Hurtful unto us, He shews
 " That the more Holy a Man is, he is the more
 " Conform unto the Image of God, which was
 " lost by the Fall, and, That he is N. B. the
 " more MEET for Heaven, wherein Holiness is
 " CONSUMMATED, He inculcates, That Holi-
 " ness is the Happiness of the Rational Creature;
 " and, That the bringing Man unto Holiness
 " was the great Design of Christ's undertaking,
 " and That, to conceive of Happiness without it, is
 " a Contradiction, seeing it is the Main Ingredient,
 " in all True Happiness. He adds P. 39. That
 the setting forth of Holiness, in these Views
 thereof, is, indeed, the True Gospel-way of
 Preaching it. Whereas, The pressing it ONLY
 under the Notion of a Mean, or Way towards
 " the attaining of Happiness, leads the Thoughts,
 " especially of Carnal Men into a Foolish Con-
 " ceit, as if Happiness were something Distinct
 " from Holiness, and to be obtained by it as a
 " Mean, and as if Holiness were not really a
 " Part, Nay, the chief Part of Happiness. Then
 He tells us, how many Poor deluded Souls, have
 such sorry notions both of Holiness and Happiness,
 while they consider not, That the great Happi-
 ness of Heaven is the Holiness of Heaven, and
 while they Think that the mere Doing of Exter-
 nal Duties, and forbearing of Sinful Practices,
 and an external Profession of Religion and such
 like, are Holiness enough; and, consider not, The
 True Nature, the Springs, the End, and proper
 Means of Holiness.

Now, The Scope of all this, is to show, that
 tho' Holiness begun here in the Soul, is a Mean
 with

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 93

with respect unto the *full Perfection* thereof in Heaven, wherein our Chief Happiness lyes, tho' it is the *Way* unto the Kingdom, and walking in it necessary to make us MEET for the full Possession; yet, That Holiness it self, should be conceived by us under the Notion of an END also, which is to be attained by *proper Means*: In a Word, the *Author's* Scope is to show, That Men should have such Views of the Beautiful Charms of Holiness, even of *that*, which may be attained in this Life, that they should set the Attainment thereof before their Eyes as a great END and SCOPE, and should consider, That there are *Means* necessary unto the Attainment even of *Holiness* here in this World, as well as, That *Holiness*, so attained, is a *Means* and *Way* towards *Eternal Happiness*.

'Tis certain there is MORE necessary, as a *Mean* towards the Attainment of that *great End* of *Holiness*, than the *mere Knowledge* of the Duties of the Law; Therefore, the Preacher, who only explains the Meaning of these Duties, and urges the Practice of them, without acquainting his Hearers by what *Means* he shall attain so great an *End* as *Holiness*, does Preach in a *Legal Strain*. I own very cheerfully, That no Man can be happy without *Holiness*, That an impure Soul could find no Happiness in Heaven it self; & that *Holiness* is a necessary *Way* & *Means* of *Happiness*; And yet, I no less freely affirm, That it ought to be SO Preached, that Men may not rest in THAT View of it ALONE, without conceiving of it as AN END to be aimed at by them *for it self*, and to be attained by *Proper Means*. Now, tho' a Preacher do not, in so many Words, tell his Audience, That they must conceive *Holiness* under no other View than that of a *Means* of *Eternal*

nal *Happiness*; Yet, if he *only* explain the *Duties* of Christianity, and urge the immediat Practice thereof, in order to attaining of *Happiness*, and do not *expressly* direct them unto the true *Means* of attaining *Holiness*, as an *End* it self to be aimed at, he does, indeed, Preach in a *Legal* Strain. I chearfully go in to what our *Author* says very exactly, P. 49. of *Holiness* as *Desireable* for it self; Yet, I can't but think it *Strange*, That he should conclude, from the *Prefacer's* urging, that it is not to be pressed *ONLY* as a *Means*, That he is not for its being urged as a *Means* AT ALL. Any Person who *Impartially* Reads the *Preface* will find the *Necessity* of *Holiness* unto *Eternal Happiness*, urged with great *Warmth* and *Plainness*.

The *Essayer* founds his *Suspicion* of this, upon a very insufficient Ground. *viz.* Because the *Prefacer* says, *Holiness* is neither *Cause*, *Title*, nor *Condition* of *Happiness*. 'Tis evident, That the *Preface* by these *Expressions* means not to deny *Holiness* to be a *CONDITIO SINE QUA NON*. For no Body, speaking of a *Condition*, in a proper Sense, doth so understand the Word. The *Prefacer*, by *Condition*, understands such a *Federal Condition* as *Adam's Holiness* was, under the *Covenant of Works*; And, I hope the *Essayer* will not say that our imperfect *Holiness* fills up that *Room* now, and comes under the same *Consideration* with *Relation* unto *Eternal Life*, That *Adam's* did. And that, our *Claim* unto *Eternal Life*, is the same way founded upon our *Holiness*, as *Adam's* was on his perfect *Obedience*, and that, we *now*, in that *Respect*, do *Work*, or do *for Life*, as he did. The *Tenor* of the *Preface* plainly shows, This to be his *Scope*. For, he often insists on the *Necessity* of *Holiness*

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING 95

in such exprefs Terms, that any *Advertent* and *Impartial Reader*, could not fuppose that he refused it to be a *Conditio sine Qua non*. But then, Tho' it should be so called, and tho' some Eminent Divines have so termed it, when the Word *Condition* used on this Subject, was more Harmless, *viz.* before the *Baxterian* and *Neonomian* Scheme of the Gospel perverted that Word; yet now, he reckons it not safe, on this Head. And therefore the *Essayer's* Harangue, on this Subject from P. 49. to P. 63. is quite besides the Point as Levell'd against that *Preface*.

'Tis Strange to see how the *Essayer* stretches, and wire-draws the Words of the *Preface*. P. 52. He will have the meaning of the *Preface* in refusing Holiness, to be *Cause, Title, or Condition* of Happiness, to be, *That it must not be Preached, that we may be disposed for the Heavenly Kingdom*, and then, insults over a meer Fancy of his own, and tells us with an *Air*, That then, it must not be look'd on as a *Means in any Sense AT ALL*. That, if it be a way we may Walk in it, if a *Means* we may Use it: All true indeed, upon this Maxim *supposito Quolibet sequitur Quodlibet*. But, The *Preface* never meant what the *Essayer* either thought Inadvertence, or ——— palms upon him. Nor does the *Preface* refuse that we may keep our Eye fixed on the *Glorious Reward*; Nay, he expressly Teaches the Necessity of *Holiness*, as a *Mean* to make us meet for Heaven.

The *Essayer's* Reasoning, P. 53. &c. is truly surprizing. He will have it to be the Opinion of the *Author* of the *Preface*, To strick off Holiness intirely from being a *Means*, or *Way AT ALL*; "Because, That *Author* says, the pressing of it, "N. B. *ONLY* under the Notion of a *Means* or "Way

“ *Way*, leads the Thoughts of Carnal Men in-
 “ to a Foolish Conceit, as if *Happiness* were some-
 “ thing Distinct from Holiness.

Our *Author*, it seems, will have *Holiness* to be a Distinct and Different Thing from *Happiness*, and finds no Fault at all in that Foolish Conceit of Carnal Men which the *Preface* Points at; And, all this Notion, our *Essayer* founds upon this, That the *Way* and the *End* are Different, and That if Holiness be a *Way* or *Means* at all, it must be Distinct from *Happiness*. Now, would it not make one Smile, after all the *Essayer's* flourishing Harangue, P. 53. and 54, upon this Subject, to find him, when he's in *A good Mood*, yielding up the whole Cause at the Beginning of P. 55. For, There, he tells us, That *Holiness* is a *Heaven begun* in our Souls. Pray, Good Mr. *Essayer*, what do you think, the *Prefacer* Meant else? Do you suppose, that when he Speaks of Holiness as not Different and Distinct from *Happiness*, That he Meant, that our Holiness, In this Life, was *Heaven* in Perfection? I can't Imagine you can allow your self in such a Ridiculous Thought. Well then, if you, as well as he, think that Holiness is a *Heaven begun*, will you have a *Heaven begun* to be *toto Caelo* Distinct and Different from a *Heaven in Perfection*? This *Begun Heaven* is the *Way* unto, and the *Means* of the Possession of *Heaven in Perfection*, and differs from it only in Degrees: Saints on Earth, Have That new Nature, That Frame of Holiness begun, which will be perfected, in Heaven. They have Communion with, and Enjoyment of that same God and Christ in Heaven and on Earth. The Objects of their Bless are the same. Only what now, they see darkly as through a Glass, they, do then, see clearly and Face to Face. Now, Sir

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 97

Holiness (as you say) be *Heaven begun*, must Conceive it as a Thing quite Different . and distinct from Heaven? And, are you, indeed, great a Stranger to the Carnal Conceits of men in a state of Nature, who do not allow themselves to look on the *Holiness* of Heaven as a chief Branch of the Happiness of that State? And you, so very unthoughtfull, as not to see, at the inculcating of Duties under no other notion but that of *Means*, and not recommending *Holiness* as a *Heaven begun*, may too much cherish the Foolish Conceits of Carnal Men as if Heaven were something quite Different from *Holiness*. Now, Sir, The Prefacer (I suppose) shews as well as you, that *Means* and *End* considered as such are not the same ; that is, That what is a *Means* is not a *Means* and an *End* in the same Respect. Nevertheless, He can (I apprehend) see no absurdity in considering the same Thing as a *Means* in one Respect and as an *End* in another. And this is Evident in *Ends* and *Means* that are Subordinate, which is the case in Hand. Heaven is the *Ultimate End* ; and, the utmost Perfection of *Holiness* attainable, is but a *Means* with Respect to *That* ; and, when viewed as a *Means*, it is to be conceived distinct from the *End*, i. e. it is not to be counted *Perfect Holiness* or *Perfect Happiness*; no Body will refuse. But then, 'Tis no Clear, That it is not a Thing of a Different Nature from the *Perfect Holiness* of Heaven, but only different in Degrees. And again, *Holiness in Time*, which, with Relation to *Holiness of Heaven*, is a *Mean* only, is, it self, an *End* which Saints ought to propose to attain by proper *Means*. And thus, it ought to be recommended and inculcated by a Gospel Minister,

and not, ONLY under the Notion of a *Mean* of Happiness. And when the *Preface* says the much, it is a most wild Fancy to alledge, he not for its being a *Means at all*.

Nor is this Way of treating this Subject Holiness, a *Subtilty* that will *Slacken our Diligence in the Way of our Dutie*; nor does it lead any to Imagine That they must behave as they were *Sticks and Stones*. The *Prefacer* is no less *Placid* and *Pathetick* in pressing Believers to stir up the Grace of God that is in them, than the *Essay* can pretend, to be: He is far from lessening the *Absolute necessity* of Holiness, or *Embracing Doctrines that have a Malignant Influence On the Practice thereof*, such as, these Antinomian Tenets the *Author* cites from *Rutherford* P. 55. And it is Unaccountable to make any Insinuation there which none that *Considers* that *Preface* can admit.

The *Essay* P. 56. tells us, he hath been surprised to Hear some, who carry their pretences of Piety pretty high, say, *That they could not endure these Ministers who insisted upon NOTHING but DO, DO, DO*. But I shall be no less surprised if our *Author* shall affirm, That he Heartily approves of the very Reverse of this. i. e. If He is pleased with these Ministers that insist, N. B. upon NOTHING but DO, DO, DO. Our *Author* must either say, that *Believing* is, in all Respects the same with *Doing*; or, he must be very displeased with them that should also Teach and Press *Believing*. For my part, if a Minister should either insist on *Nothing* but *Do, Do, Do*; Or, on the other Hand, on *Nothing* but *Believe, Believe, Believe*; I should be Heartily displeased with both these Ways of Preaching. I'm perswaded the True Gospel Minister will not separate the Dear Companions, *Faith and Practice*.

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 99

Our *Essayer* tells us he knows none who are so *Impious* or *Ignorant* as to drop their Creed. But, may not a Gospel Strain of direct insisting on many Gospel Doctrines be neglected without dropping our Creed? And further, may not The Articles of our Creed be, in themselves, opened and explained, and yet, not in a Right Manner used and connected with Gospel Holiness, as the Preface it self owns. Our *Author* says further, That, He knows none who do not press Faith in Jesus as N. B. The ROOT of Holy Obedience, or, who bid us Do that we may be justified, or, who do not lay Union with Christ as the Foundation of an Holy Life --- 'Tis well if it be so indeed: But, will He not be pretty much surprized, if I shall say unto him *THOW ART THE MAN*. Pray Good Mr. *Essayer* receive the Conviction, and Answer me a few Questions. Is true *Evangelical Repentance* any Branch of Holy Obedience? If it be, then is not Faith in Jesus Christ, the Root of it? And, if so, must not Faith be before it, seeing the Root is before the Fruit? And if so, must not Justification be, in Order of Nature, before it too, because Faith Unites us to Christ, as the Lord our Righteousness? This also you say here, when you affirm, that Union with Christ is N. B. The FOUNDATION of a Holy Life. Now If so, Then Repentance flows from it and is Built on it. But, I was much Mistaken if you have not been teaching the Contrary of all this a few Pages before. I think you have told us we must Repent that we may be justified. i. e. We must DO some thing that we may be justified, for Repentance not being the Instrument of Justification, it can be no otherways Related to it than

A REVIEW of an ESSAY,
as a *Good Work*: Yet, here, you say, 'Tis wrong
Preaching to bid a Man *Do* that he may be
justified: You may, Sir, if you think fit try a
little of your *Scholar-craft* to Reconcile your *Jelf*,
with your *Jelf*.

I know 'tis said, that a Minister is not to be con-
structed a *Legal Preacher*, who does not in every
Sermon direct his Hearers to Christ for Strength
and *Acceptance*. Indeed if a Minister's Habitual
Strain be to Preach in a Gospel-way, Charity
will oblige one to think, as our Author here
Suggests P. 57. Nevertheless I must say, con-
sidering the Proneness of our Hearts to some
thing in our selves as our *Righteousness* and *Strength*,
it can never be accounted out of the Way, to
Preach every Sermon, in the very Strain and
Channel of the Gospel, directing Men to the
Fountain of Strength. The *Preface* very well
expresseth this Matter P. 36. in these Words:
" The *Legal Preacher* insists either upon Gospel
" Truths or the *Duties* of the Law *Separatly*: The
" *True Gospel preacher*, never separat them, but
" sweetly Connects them, in their due Method,
" and Order; That is, He makes, allways, *Gospel*
" *Doctrines*, the Foundation of Holy Practice:
" And tho' sometimes, he may insist more upon
" the *One*, and some *Times* more upon the *Other*;
" yet he never Omits, in every Sermon, less or
" more, to bring in *both*, in their proper Place.
You may read forward and you will find this con-
vincingly Clear in the following Pages of that *Pre-*
face, to which I need add nothing on this Head.

Our *Essayer* falls next into, I know not what
sort of an *Extasie*. P. 57. But it is such a *fit*, as
seems to have driven him quite out of that *Cool*
and *Calm Temper* whereof he speaks P. 31. The
Man *Raves* like on in a *Fever*, when he In-

sinuats

On G
sinuat
like S
Suppla
Lauda
upon,
Defini
" thes
" selv
" thei
" a ha
" supp
" fump
" and
" *Faith*
" mine
" *Other*
" Sin
" Ruin
indeed!
off these
the Ra
from Ch
clusions
the Con
have of
ted and
without
torting
PITIFU
MPUD
his Exp
n a little
ells us,
ect of t
with the
hink of
ur *Essay*

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 101
sinuats, That the Prefacer and some Others of a
like Strain, are, *offended at Doing*, are *Solifidians* and
Supplanters of Christian Practice: And then, after the
Laudable Example of P. Hadow, He perches
upon, what some will have to be the *Marrow's*
Definition of Faith, and learnedly Infers, That
“ these *Authors* are for Mens *Doing nothing* them-
“ selves for the saving of their Souls, That
“ their Scheme is a *Wretched one* that affords them
“ a handsome Apologie for a bad Life, that
“ supplies the want of good Works by a Pre-
“ sumptuous Confidence that Christ has done all
“ and that we need do nothing, That they make
“ *Faith and Practice* Clash together, and Under-
“ mine the *One* under a pretence of Raising the
“ *Other*, That they make Christ the Minister of
“ Sin and Exalt his *Priestly Office* upon the
“ Ruines of his *Kingly Power*. A Flaming Speech
indeed! which, one would think, he had Copied
off these Characters Church History gives us of
the Raverys of the *Valentinians* of Old, who
from Chimerical Principles, drew Detestable Con-
clusions as to *Morals*, as *Dapin* tells us. But,
the Consciousness, These Authors, (so abused)
have of their being Unaccountably misconstru-
cted and slandered by *THIS AUTHOR*, may,
without Breach of Charity, bear them out in re-
porting His *Fine Phrase* upon himself. O!
PITIFULL IGNORANCE! & WRETCHED
IMPUDENCE! Perhaps, However, He thinks
his *Exploit* a Meritorious Action, which may,
in a little, advance him to the Ch --- r. *Tertulian*
tells us, That *BALENTINUS* the Author of the
Sect of the *VALENTINIANS* was so swelled
with the Conceit of his Merit that it made him
think of being made a *Bishop*. I do not think
our *Essayer* is so very aspiring; Yet he has given
such

such a *Swatch* of his Talent of Writting, That, perhaps, in a little Time, The *Watch-word* may be given at all the *Avenews* of the City to advance him into the P --- r. D --- 'rs Honourable *Post*. But, Howsoever, some may, be fond of this *Author's* Flourishes, when he Charges the *Prefacer* and others whom he pretends to Confute, with *Licencious Sentiments*, with devising *A new Gospel* that Reconciles the Hopes of Heaven with a bad Life, With raiseing *Faith* on the Ruines of *Practice*, and making a mighty OPPOSITION unto good Works; and Compares them unto *Simon Magus* and the Impure GNOSTICKS, P. 58. Yet, I'm so dull as to discern nothing in all this *Speech*, but a *Regnant Spirit of Slander*. Nor can I see, for what End he brings in the Account of *The Popish Doctrine of Merit*, and the *Reformation-Principles* in Opposition thereunto, and the Corruption of these Principles by some Pretenders at that Time, if it be not to Insinuate, that the *Prefacer*, and Others like minded, are like these *False Dreaming Persons* who vented *Filthy Doctrines* at that Time, and that they deny *Good Works* to be necessary unto Salvation. If this be not his Intent, I profess, I can't reach it.

How unaccountable is it in our *Essayer*, again, and again, as in P. 60. &c. to insinuate That the *Prefacer* and Others of his Opinion are offended at the pressing of *Duties*. This is a groundless Calumny. Nor do any of these *Authors* quarrel any Man for urging Duties by *Gospel Motives* from *Gospel Principles* and to *Gospel Ends*. Our *Essayer* is miserably Mistaken of the Men; for it is not the urging of *Duties themselves*, but the neglect of that *Gospel Way* of insisting on them which they find Fault with. And I heartily

Sub

Subscribe to our Authors Sentiments P. 61.
 That it is Impious to make a *Saviour* of our
Duties, to make them our justifying Righte-
 ousness, to place them in Christ's Room, to
 urge the Performance of them, without de-
 riving Strength from Christ's Grace and Spi-
 rit, to Tell Men that N. B. They go *before*,
 and do not follow *Faith* as the Fruits of it.
 All this (he says) would be to Preach in a
 wrong Way. It were a Thousand Pities of
 the Man. He is as right in all this as my
 Heart could wish. Only, I own it is above my
Scholar-craft, to make this and other ways of
 speaking in This *Essay*, hang together: For I
 would think when he tells us, That it would
 be a wrong Way of Preaching to say That *Du-*
ties go BEFORE and do not FOLLOW Faith as the
FRUITS of it, That he should, in Consequence,
 maintain that the Duty of Repentance and for-
 taking of Sin, does not go *before* but follow *Faith*
 as the *Fruit* of it; I should think if *Faith* be the
Root and Duties the Fruit, it is a *Preposterous Way*
of preaching, to insist constantly, er, in a Man's Ha-
 bitual Strain, upon the *Fruit*, and not inculcate
 what concerns the *Root*, in a Peculiar Manner,
 considering especially, That where this *Root* of
Faith is, it never fails, less or more, to *Work by Love*
 to bring forth *Fruit*. And, to use our *Author's*
 Words, What can offend him at *Believing* when
 the *Preachers* of it, plainly and, in express Terms,
 assert, That it is the *Root and Spring* of New Obe-
 dience, That *Faith* worketh by Love, and pro-
 duce the *Fruits of Holiness*, and do recommend
 it for that very End? What could move the *Au-*
thor to insinuate P. 61. as if these Men, the *Pre-*
acher, and those like minded, were for laying
Duty intirely aside? Nay, I believe, These *Au-*
thors,

thor, will chearfully say, with him, **GOD FOR BID.** *Let Christ have his Room, and Duty its place in Subjection unto him. It is the Way to the Kingdom and we can never Expect Peace and Comfort from Jesus Christ, but in the Way of commanded Duty.*

The *Essay* proceeds P. 63. to another Instance of what he tells us he cannot think is **LEGAL DOCTRINE**, viz. The asserting the **CONDITIONALITY** of the Covenant of Grace.

He owns, That he is not for a **CONDITION** if by Condition be meant, *That which Merits a Thing at the Hand of God.* No great wonder he reject this, For, even *Perfect Obedience in Adam* was not properly *Meritorious*, tho' it was a *Federal Condition.* He rejects it also, *as it founds a Title to Heaven*: I am glad of this, I hope we shall come pretty near other on this Head, if he holds on. He refuseth it likewise, *as practicable in our own Strength*; Very good all, I hope then, 'Tis freely given to us to *Believe.* He advances, and adds further, *That it is not any Thing done by that comes in the Room of PERFECT OBEDIENCE under the FIRST COVENANT.* Excellent yet! I'm heartily pleas'd with all this. He concludes *It is no any Thing PREVIOUS as the Condition of THE FIRST GRACE,* This, he owns, is absolutely *promis'd and given,* and Proves it from *Jerem. 32. 37. &c. Ezek. 36. 26. &c.* All this I frankly own. But, how, then, is it made Evident, That the Covenant of Grace is a **CONDITIONAL COVENANT**? Why, he tells us P. 65. *That the Covenant of Grace must be CONDITIONAL and that FAITH must be the CONDITION thereof,* and we take **CONDITION** in the Sense of **MR. FLAVEL** and our **LARGER CATECHISM** Ans. to Question 32. viz. *The Grace of God is manifested in the second COVE*

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 105
COVENANT, in that he freely provideth, and offereth to Sinners a Mediator and Life and Salvation by him, and requiring FAITH as the CONDITION to INTEREST them in him. And the Author goes on, to explain the Difference between an *Interesting*, and an *intitling* Condition, and owns, that it is the Righteousness of the SURETY that comes in Place of Adam's perfect Righteousness as the *intitling* Condition, and that Faith is the Bond of Union with Christ & *Interests* us in him. Well then, I think we will not Dispute about Faith's being the Condition of the Covenant of Grace in the *strict* and proper Sense of the Term CONDITION; for, This, I think, our Author himself does not contend for; Nor, on the other hand, will I refuse, That Faith may be called the Condition to Interest us in Christ as our Standard asserts: And, for my Heart, I can't conceive that any Thing else can be meant by this, than, That FAITH is such a Condition, as UNION is of UNION; and that, sure, is a very large and improper Sense. Faith is set forth by such Acts as are properly Instrumental, such as *Apprehending, Receiving, Taking hold of, Applying, cleaving unto, Relying, and Resting on Christ*. But who, that understands what a Condition properly Means, will affirm, That these are proper unto a Condition, strictly taken. 'Tis Evident, then, to me, that the Assembly take the Word Condition in a large improper Sense, as the Way and Mean, which God makes Use of for making up our Union with Christ, and so not properly as the Condition of Union, but as the very Uniting Act, or Mean of Union.

Our Author acknowledgeth, That the First Grace is absolutely promised. Now, I hope, it is the first Grace, by which we are brought within the Bond of the Covenant; And, why the whole nature of that free Covenant of Grace, should Receive

ceive its Denomination from the Connection betwixt *this first Grace*, and *other Subsequent Graces and Blessings*, and not rather from that which brings one into *That Covenant-State*, I cannot see: Especially seeing 'tis granted, That Faith it self is given *freely*, without any *Antecedent Condition* unto the Reception of that *first Grace*. I hope our *Essayer* will not refuse, That the very *Spring* of all the Promises of the Covenant, is the *free Grace and Mercy of God*, and not, any *Thing done* or that *can be done* by the *Creature*; I hope likewise, he will own that all the *Benefits of the Covenant are purchas'd by Christ*, and that they are in his Hands, and may be bestowed by him at any Time, on those for whom they are purchas'd; I hope, he will also acknowledge That these Benefits are only promised in *Him*, who is, *Himself, the great Covenant Promise*, and That, in giving Him, all other Blessings are *given and insured thro' Him*, and for his Sake. Now, if this be truly the State of Things, one would think, That the Covenant of Grace, hath more of *Absoluteness* in its Nature, Than of *proper Conditionality*.

I do acknowledge, God hath establish'd a certain Connection among the Benefits of the Covenant as well as a certain order, both of *Nature and Time* in bestowing of 'em. There is a sweet Connection between *Grace* here, and *Glory* hereafter: They differ not in *Nature* but in *Degree*. There's an Order also, of bestowing 'em, *first Grace* and *then Glory*. But, both of 'em are Promises made Originally to Christ as our *Head* and the *2d Adam*, and to the Elect in him: Both of 'em are Benefits purchas'd by Him for them, and in his Hand; Both of 'em are *freely* promised & *freely* given; Both of 'em are *absolutely* secured

On GO
secured
yet, T
Now
of Bene
red is:
with h
blessed
lutly s
ring T
in the
LUTE
more t
ing of
I see n
nant s
from 2
all the
madete
I think
in the
are Co
flowin
Thing
Coven
tion o
the m
I'm C
absolut
are ca
Promi
selves.
Som
der th
Coven
GRAC
chasse
Confer

secured to the *Elect* in the Hands of a Mediator; yet, They are conferred, in a certain Order. Now if, on account of this Order and Connection of *Benefits*, one shall say, The Benefit *first* conferred is a *Condition* of the *last*, I shall not contend with him if he mean no more but *That established Order of bestowing*, what is, otherwise, *absolutely secured and promised*. But, then, considering That these Promises called *Conditional* are in the Sense now explained *Reductively ABSOLUTE*, and, That their *Conditionality* is no more than that of *Connection* and Order of *Bestowing* of what is *freely* promised and *freely* given; I see not, why the Denomination of the Covenant should be taken from *thence*, and not rather from *That*, which is the *True Rise and Spring* of all the Benefits thereof, *viz. The absolute Promise made to Christ and unto his Seed in him*. In a Word, I think it is *one Thing* to say, There are *Conditions* in the Covenant, meaning thereby, That there are *Connections* of Benefits in the Order of *Bestowing* them all *freely* by Grace; and, *another Thing* to call the Covenant it self a *Conditional Covenant*. I humbly conceive, The Denomination of the Covenant *it self* should be taken from the most *Extensive* and *full View* of it, and then, I'm Confident we must ultimately resolve all in *absolute Promises* which take in even these which are called *Conditional* and are *really* *Connectional* Promises with respect to *after-Benefits* among themselves.

Some Men, considering *Holiness*, ONLY under the Notion of a *Duty* belonging unto the Covenant, and not conceiving of it, *also*, as a GRACE, and COVENANT-BLESSING purchased by Christ, which he has undertaken to Confer on his *Elect* in due Time, have represented

sented it as a *strict Covenant-Condition*, and so brought it into the *Matter* of our *justifying Righteousness*. Indeed, If we consider *Holiness* as a *Part* of *Happiness*, and an *Earnest* of *Glory*, and *The Exercise of Grace and Acts of Holiness*, as a *Preparation* for it, we may, on this Account own, That they are such *fitting* and *disposing Means* as makes us meet to be *Partakers* of that *Glorious Inheritance* of the *Saints in Light*; but, all this will not import that they have any *proper Causality*, or, That they are the *Foundation* of our *Right* unto that *Inheritance*.

But considering, That, the *Chief Debate* concerning the *Conditionality* of the *Covenant* is with Respect to *Faith* which is the great *Instrumental Mean* of *Receiving, Applying* and *Appropriating* Christ himself the *Great Covenant Blessing* and other *Covenant Blessings* in and *Through* Him, we must particularly take it under Consideration.

Now, I do freely Acknowledge, That *Faith* is absolutely necessary to Interest us in the *Lord Jesus*, and the *Benefits* of his *Purchase*: Nevertheless, being no more but an *Instrument*, it ought not to be admitted, as the *Matter* of our *Evangelical Righteousness*, as a fulfilling of the *New Law of Grace*, which some have set up in the *Room* of *God's Covenant of Grace*. I Hope our *Essayer* is not so far gone into *Legalism* as to fall in with this *New-Scheme*. And indeed I own, He is more sound than many *Others* on this *Head*.

But further, That we may have a *Clear View* of *Faith's Interest* in the *Covenant*, and may see what kind of *Conditionality* is truly to be ascribed unto it, and whether, on that Account, The *Covenant* it self ought to be termed a *Conditional Covenant*, let us consider, That no *Benefits* whatsoever,

On G
soever
Condit
session
unless
which
cessary
being
Promi
the M
Those
Terms
the S
Propri
called
ly pro
or othe
them, an
free an
absolute
of the
can't h
of it.
the Con
of tha
cannot
but in
oned.
This
we con
Free G
least P
if there
That t
absolut
be Ter
That t
the giv

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 109

soever, whether conveyed by an *absolute*, or *Conditional* Promise can be *Ours* N. B. In Possession, i.e. we cannot have an *Actual Interest* in them, unless they be *received* by *Us*; Hence, *Faith*, which is the *Receiving Instrument*, is *absolutely necessary*, in the Nature of the Thing, unto our being *Interested therein*. And therefore, The Promise of Blessings made unto *Faith*, are, upon the Matter, no less *absolute in themselves* than Those, which run in more *General* and *absolute* Terms; For, even *These* must tacitly suppose the Sinners *Reception* thereof. Now, in what Propriety of Speech, can the *Covenant* it self be called a *Conditional Covenant*, because, The freely promised Benefits thereof, must be *received*, or *otherways*, a Person cannot have an *Interest* in them, and *Possession* of 'em? Let us suppose the *most free and absolute Promise*, nay, The *most free and absolute Gift*, sure 'tis necessary, in the Nature of the Thing, that a Person *Receive* it, else he can't have an *Actual Interest* in it, & *Possession* of it. But, who will say, That this *Reception*, is the *Condition* of that Benefite, in the *proper Sense* of that Word? And therefore, our *Confession*, cannot be understood to use it any otherways, but in the *Large* and *Improper* Sense above-mentioned.

This View of Matters, is the more plain, if we consider, That this very *Faith* it self, is the *Free Gift of God*, and, That we have not the least Power, in our selves, to exert it. Now, if there be no *Condition* of this *Condition*, but, That this *First Grace* is *absolutely Promised*, and *absolutely Given*, why should the *Covenant* it self be *Termed* **CONDITIONAL**? For, be it so, That there's an established Connection betwixt the giving of *Faith*, and the giving of *other Benefits*;

fits; Yet, if *that Faith* it self be *absolutely* and *freely* Promised and Given, sure, all these other Benefits connected therewith are *Reductively* so too. *i. e.* They all Issue, and Terminate in an *absolute Promise*. But; what if I should say further, That these *after-Blessings* are no less *absolutely* and *freely* given than *Faith* it self is, and Consequently, That it is not, in a proper Sense, a *Federal*, or even a *Suspending Condition*. I hinted already, That *Faith*, properly speaking, is not an *Antecedent Prerequisite Condition* unto *Union with Christ*, but the very *Uniting Act* it self; That is, we are not to conceive of a Person having *Faith*, subsisting in him; as a distinct Benefit, and that having this *Faith*, he comes to be immediatly thereafter united unto *Christ*; But, That *Faith* is that *Grace*, which, in it's very Nature as acted and exerted, does, in that very Act Unite to *Christ*; But then, it can't be called the *Prerequisite Condition* of that *Union*, but is, indeed, the *Uniting Instrument*; And, the Soul, being thus United unto *Christ*, *Faith* is also the *Instrument*, but not properly, The, *Condition* of *Justification*, which, doth natively follow upon *Faith's* Receiving and Applying *Christ's* Righteousness, and so, is an *Instrument* inseparably connected with *Justification*, but not properly the *Condition* thereof. That it Interests us in *Christ* and his Benefits, or gives us the *jus in re*. I cheerfully own, and it is in no other Sense, that our *Standard* uses the Word; but, That it gives us the *jus ad rem*, which is the proper Sense of a *Condition*, I have not yet seen, and Consequently, I cannot think, That it is so very Congruous to Term the Covenant it self, a **CONDITIONAL COVENANT**, Tho' I know sound Divines have, sometimes so Termed it, Meaning no more than such an *Interesting Condition*.

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. III
as our *Standard* mentions, and against which I contend not. But further, 'tis to be considered, That the Word *Condition* was more Harmless of *Old*, than it hath been of *Late* when it hath been corrupted and abused by the *Baxterian* and *Neonomian* Scheme, making the *Gospel* a *New Preceptive Law* with Sanction; and therefore, it should be the more Cautiously used NOW, if any will still retain it. Only, I must say, That it appears to me, not to be so lyable to a wrong Construction to say, There are *Conditions* in the Covenant, (Meaning thereby such *Conditions* of Connection, as have been above explain'd,) as to say, That the Covenant it self is a **CONDITIONAL COVENANT**; For, no Reasons can be assign'd, why the very Denomination of the Covenant it self should be taken from *every Thing* that is in it; one would rather think, it should be taken from that which is the very *Rise* and *Spring* of it, and which *runs thro' the whole* of it, viz. Free Grace and the *absolute Promises* thereof.

I would fain ask our *Essayer*, what is the Condition of *Regeneration*? I hope he won't make *Faith* the Condition of *That*, I am perswaded he will not pretend there can be any *previous Conditions*, unto that *New Creation*, and, as it were, *Resurrection* from the Dead. Now, I freely own, That the *Spiritual Life* given in *Regeneration* is *preserved*, and *maintained*, and, That, The Lord hath appointed *proper Means* of this *Preservation*, and, That, in the use of these Means, with the Concurrence of the Divine Blessing, That *Spiritual Life* is, indeed, *maintained*, & *preserved*; I own, That, as *Faith* in *Jesus Christ* is that *Instrument*, whereby the Soul is United unto Christ, So, it is, in it's Exercise, ever after, The Great and *Principal Mean*, by which, *Spiritual Life* is *preserved*;

served; For, as the *Apostle* says, *It is the very Life we now Live.* Gal. 2. 20.

'Tis True, 'Tis said, *He that Believeth shall be Saved, and he that Believeth not shall be Damned;* But, I can't think these are *Expressures* of the *Tenor* of the *Covenant*, but only *Commands* and *Threatnings* suited unto a Gospel Dispensation, and adopted *thereinto*, for advancing the *Ends* thereof. I rather think, That the *True Nature* and *Tenor* of the *Covenant of Grace* is to be taken from these *Scriptures* which directly speak of that *Covenant*, as *Jer.* 32. 33. and *Heb.* 8. 8. which run in the *absolute Terms* of *I WILL*, and *THU SHALT*.

The *Essayer's* Reasonings, P. 66. and 67. concerning the *Conditionality* of the *Promise* of *Forgiveness* may be, with equal Strength, retorted upon himself with Respect to the *Promise* of the *First Grace*, which he owns is *absolute*, P. 64. For, if it be so, (according to our *Essayer's* Way of Reasoning) This *absolute* *Promise* of the *First Grace* either respects *Sinners* as *Sinners*, and so all *Sinners* must have the *First Grace*, or *Elect* *Sinners* as such, and then, nothing more is required but their *Election*, in order to their having the *First Grace*; and then, if he will say there's any Thing required before the *First Grace*, as a Condition of bestowing it, he must make the *Promise* of the *First Grace* *Conditional*, and not *absolute*. And, why the *Covenant* should not be Denominated from such *Promises* as bring us within the Bond of it, which are *absolute*, reither than from *These* *Connections* among *Subsequent Benefites*, which are also freely promised and given in a *Beautiful Order*, I see not; Considering especially, That all these as well as the *First Grace* are made over to the *Mediator*, with whom the *Covenant* stands fast, and thro' him, are, in due *Time*, and manner freely conveyed unto his *Seed*.

As to his QUOTATIONS P. 69. I own *Wor-*
by *Men* have used the Terms Condition in a more
large Sense, as our *Standard doth*: But I hope some
of these Expressions are not to be stretched too far,
if they meant *Federal Conditions* in the strict
sense of the Words, or according unto the Scheme
of the *New-Law-Men*. Nor do I think, the
phrase of *Suspending Conditions*, very agree-
able; Seeing what they *Call* so, is only *Necessa-*
to give a *jus in re*, or Possession of promised
benefits, and not *jus ad rem*, or even a *Pactional*
title thereunto, which is the proper Sense of a Con-
on.

As to what, the *Essayer* says P. 71. of the
rise of Mistakes about this Matter: I own that
confused Notions of the Covenant of *Redemption*
and *Grace*, of *Faith*, of the Difference betwixt
the Covenant of *Grace*, and the Covenant of
Works, and, of the *Parallel* between the *First* and
second Adam, will indeed carry a Man unto Mis-
takes about this Subject. But I am perswaded, they
have the clearest View of these Things, who, tak-
ing a distinct View of the Covenant of *Grace*, in
itself, do consider it as *Gods Covenant*, absolutely
and freely framed, and no less freely applied, ac-
cording to the due *Order* of bestowing all the Be-
fits included in it. This I might illustrate
by a *Particular* Consideration of these Things
were I not happily prevented by what I have
written in a Book just now published Entitled, *A*
Further Enquiry into the Grounds of the present Diffe-
rences in the Church of Scotland, which I earnestly
commend to your *Serious Perusal* and am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

H

LET. IV:

LETTER IV.

S I R,

I go on to the last Head of Legalism P. 72. viz. That Believer's Sins, in their justified State, bring them under a Liableness to the threatned and deserved Punishment according to the Sanction of the Law.

The Prefacer, having suggested, That this Error Deserves the Mark of the Displeasure of a Protestant Church, our Essayer who supposeth that this Mark can be nothing else but DEPOSITION, is extremely fired, and treats the Author with Abundance of empty Scoff, P. 73. and 74. But, Sir, may not the Church put a Mark of their Displeasure upon the ERROR and yet not DEPOSE the PERSONS? Nay, Prudence can very well Direct them how to Distinguish between Persons and Things, and Persons and Persons too, as a little Reflection upon the proceedings of the Church with Respect to Pr. Simson and the late Representatives will easily inform you.

I am not of the Essayer's Opinion, That this ERROR is generally received by the Ministers of this Church. I know P. Hadow is much regarded, but I can't think we are yet so Implicite, as to swallow down his Dictats, without Examination.

Now, let us state the Matter clearly, a Druggery, which our Essayer thinks it below him to stoop unto. It is owned, on all Hands, That Believers do truly and properly Sin against God, and Transgress his Laws as well as others; That these Sins do, in their own Nature, Deserve Wrath; That, while in their Natural State, be-

GOS
e they
le unto
ified,
at the
rance
at Par
; Tha
he Ob
ch is
ings b
is co
actu
Belie
n. Tho
Fault
their S
o they
Eterna
r, is r
Thre
etimes
State
bleness
yahlene
displeas
Now,
tainin
sified
threa
ling to
his Qu
tent Q
r's pre
he c
very l
Glory,
Nor
fore

GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 115

e they be justified they are *under the Curse*, and
 le unto *Eternal Death*; That, when they are
 ified, *all Antecedent Sins are actually Remitted*;
 at the Remission of *after Sins*, as well as ad-
 stance unto Heaven is secured, as to the *Event*;
 at Pardon of Sin relates unto the *Guilt* of
 ; That the *Guilt* which Pardon Removes,
 he *Obligation or Liableness* unto the *Punishment*,
 ich is contracted by the *Fault*. Now, These
 ings being, on all Hands, yielded, The Ques-
 n is concerning the Nature of that *Guilt*, or
 actual *Obligation* unto *Punishment*, which
 Believer contracts by his Sins after Justifica-
 n. There's no Contest about *Guilt* taken for
 Fault it self, nor about the *Intrinsick Demerit*
 heir Sins; But, about that *Punishment* where-
 o they contract an *Obligation*, Whether this
Eternal Death, or only *Fatherly Chastisements*:
 r, is the Question anent the *Practical use* of
 r *Threatnings*, even unto Believers, who,
 etimes, may have the Evidences of their justifi-
 State clouded; but, anent the *real Guilt*, and
 bleness it self which is contracted, whether this
 yableness to *Eternal Death*, or only, unto *Father-*
 ispleasure.

Now, P. Hadow, and our *Essayer* after him,
 ntain, That the Believer's Sins, even in their
 ified State, bring them under a *Liableness* to
 threatned and Deserved Punishment, ac-
 cording to the *Sanction of the Law*.

His Quotations P. 74. 75. do not reach the
 sent Question, which is not concerning a Be-
 r's present meetness for Heaven; For, as to
 he can never be said to be *Wholly meet* till
 very last Step, when he enters the *Threshold*
Glory, and is Stript of all the *Remainders* of
 Nor is it to be doubted, but the Believer's

Sins are, in their own Nature, *Damnable* for we don't Maintain the Doctrine of the distinction between Sins *Mortal* and *Venial*; some, by making Distinctions about the Belief of Sins, do seem to come too near this *Papish* *Principle*. We see that Mr. *Le Blanc* explains what he Means by the *Novus Aeternae mortis Reatus*. A being *Unmeet* to enter into the Kingdom of God. But this is not at all the Case in Hand; the Question concerning *Actual Meetness* for Heaven Relating unto the *Article* of *Sanctification*, and not *That* of *Justification*: For, as to *Justification* the Sinner is *Meet*, and never again *Ceases* to be *Meet*, i. e. the *Perfect Robe of Christ's Righteousness* being once put on, he is never again *Stript* of it. I had Thought, this had been *A received* *testant Doctrine*, That *Justification* is perfected *First*, but *Sanctification* carried on *Gradually*, must own 'tis new to me to Hear of a further *Meetness* in Point of *Justification*, with Respect to *Guilt*, or the Removal of the Obligation to *Eternal Death*, Than what the *Elect Sinner* is advanced unto when brought into a justified State and Adopted into Gods Family. I had always thought that no *After-Sins* could alter that *Sanctified* State, which yet they must needs do, if they bring them under a *Liableness* unto *Eternal Death* according to the *Sanction* of the Law. I now thought that Believers are no more in a State of *Condemnation*; No more under the Law, and the *Covenant of Works*, and so, No more under the *Curse*. But what will not some Men of *piety* do? *Wit* not *DETECT*, and Men of a *Bold* *Daring Genius* not *ESSAY*? But with their good leave, I Fear they have gone too far on, to *pervert* the *Gospel of Christ*.

Our *Author* tells us P. 75. That some *Sound* *Divines* Maintain, That all Sins past, present and to come, are *actually* pardoned upon the first Act of Faith; but He thinks fit to run Cross to these *Sound* *Divines*; And tells us P. 76. That 'Tis Incon-
 veivable how a Crime can be pardoned before
 be committed, and then, in some following
 ges diverts quite from the state of the Question,
 a long Harangue about a Believer's praying
 for Pardon, and anent the Sense of Pardon.

But all this Flame may soon be quenched, by
 little Cool Consideration. Our *Author* huddles
 o Things in *Fair Generals*, and then Talks big,
 ke a *Bully*, that hath more *Air* than either *Art*
 Courage. Pray, Good Sir, let me ask you
 ravelly, what is That *Guilt* which *Pardon* Removes?
 it not the *Actual* Obligation unto Eternal Death?
 ow, if This *Actual* Obligation unto Eterna' Death,
 e removed from the Person of the Believer,
 hen, by *Faith* he comes into a justified State,
 ill you say his *After-Sins* brings him again
 nder that Obligation? If you do, you must
 y that *Justification* is a very *Moveable Benefit*:
 and I can't tell when you will have the Believer
 fix that Moment, wherein he can say, he is
 stified. Sir, your Mistake seems to proceed
 om this, That you Consider not the Nature of
 e *Guilt* contracted by a Believer's *After-Sins*;
 ow this *Guilt* is not *Law-Guilt*, or an Obliga-
 on unto the *Curse*, but an Obligation unto
 artherly Chastisements, and Consequently, the
 ardon, that a Believer needs and Prays for,
 a Believer, or, under this View can be no other
 an the Removal of This Obligation. Indeed,
 ne who *Really is a Believer*, may want the Sense
 his being so; In which Case he both may and
 ill plead for Pardon in the strictest Sense; But
 if

if he do, upon good Grounds, look on himself as a Believer, he can plead for Pardon in no other Respect, than what is Consistent with his State. So then, the Question is not anent the Way in which a Believer, under different Impressions of himself, may Pray for Pardon, but about what *Really is That Guilt* which his *After-Sins* bring him under. Now, I say That *the Guilt* which lies upon a *Lyableness* unto *Eternal Death* is such as he cannot fall into, without falling from *Grace* and His *justified State*.

It mends not the Matter to Talk of the Security which the Believer hath with Respect to the *Event*: For, as to this, The *Elect*, before Conversion, have full Security as to the *Event*, yet their *Justification*, makes a real Alteration of their State. But, according to the *Director* and *Essayer's New Scheme*, Believers are much in the same State with Respect to *Justification*, seeing new Sins bring them again under *Lyableness* to *Eternal Death*.

Our *Essayer's Prayers* and *Quotations*, P. 7. evidently shew how much he mistakes the Question and falls into a *Jumble of Incoherent Notions*; while, he considers not the Believer's State by *Justification*, or the *Nature of his Guilt* and the Right Manner of his applying for Pardon. And, in his Reasonings P. 80. and 81. he just begs the *Question*, and Misrepresents what is said by some Authors anent the preventing *Lyableness* unto *Eternal Death*; The plain Meaning whereof, is, That the *Obligation* unto *Eternal Death*, being taken off from N. B. their Persons by the first *Constitutive Justification*, the Natural Consequence of this State of their Persons is, that all after *Lyableness* unto *Eternal Death* is prevented. And, where is the absurdity to conceive

On G
that C
nal in
would
ing E
intire
N. B.
Guilt
moun
of a
brou
Spous
Have
Now
disinh
White
then,
which
not a
that
but t
Term
takes
Etern
posin
comm
alway
Christ
Being
That
take
son, so
Oblig
State
of ou
berty
the G
GUIL

that God, who finds the *Elect* Man a *Guilty Criminal* in his Sight, who both *had* Committed and *would* Commit *Sins*, in their own Nature, *deserving* *Eternal Death*, should, in the Justifying Act, intirely dissolve that *Obligation* and *Lyableness* N. B. of HIS PERSON thereunto? So that, any *Guilt* he might afterwards Contract, should amount to no more but *Lyableness* to the *Chastisements* of a *Father*. And Pray, Sir, are not *Believers* brought into *God's Family*? Are they not the *Spouse* of Christ? Are they not his *Children*? Have they not put on Christ's *Righteousness*? Now, Sir, Is *That Marriage* dissolved? Are they disinherited? Are they ever divested of *That White Rob* of *Righteousness*? And, can they, then, come under *Lyableness* unto a *Punishment* which is only *Competent* unto an *Angry Judge*, and not an *offended Father* to inflict? I Refuse not that *Lyableness* is prevented by *Actual Remission*; but then, I say, The *first Constitutive Justification* Terminates upon the *Person*, alters his *State* at once, takes off all *Lyableness* of N. B. *That Person* unto *Eternal Wrath*. The alledged Absurdity in supposing that *Sins* can be *Pardoned* before they be committed, is a *mere Quirk*. *Moral Causes* do not, always, require the *Presence* of their *Objects*. Christ's *Death* had *Influence* before it had a *Being*. And where is the Absurdity to conceive That God in Justifying the *Sinner* does by one Act take off all *Lyableness* to *Eternal Death* from his *Person*, so as his *after-Sins* can bring him under no other *Obligation*, than what is consistent with that *State of Justification*. And, This is the Doctrine of our Church, *Confess*: Chap. 20. §. 1. *The Liberty* which Christ hath purchassed for *Believers* under the Gospel consists in their **FREEDOM FROM THE GUILT OF SIN**, &c. Now, what is this *Guilt* but

but *Lyableness* unto *Eternal Death*. And Chap. 11. §. 5. the *Lyableness* which the Sins of Believers bring them under, is exprest in these Words. *They may, by their Sins, fall under God's FATHERLY DISPLEASURE, and, not have the Light of his Countenance restored unto them, until they humble themselves, Confess their Sins, N. B. beg Pardon and Renew their Faith and Repentance.* Hence 'tis plain, That the Pardon *Believers*, as such must beg, must answer unto the *Guilt or Lyableness* which they contract, and, This our *Confess.* does not say, is *Eternal Death* (which could not mis to have been said here had they been of that Opinion) but only *Fatherly Displeasure*, and the want of the *Light of Gods Countenance*

The *Essayer's* Reasonings P. 82 upon the Believer's being under the *Penal Sanction* of the Law proceeds upon this Mistake, That a *Penal Sanction* is ESSENTIAL unto, and inseparable from a Law. Now, taking it for granted, That our *Essayer* will own, That all *Rational Beings*, are under the Law of God, I would ask him, Whether, The *confirmed Angels* be not under the Law? And yet, I hope, he won't say they are under the *Sanction Threatning Eternal Death*. Nay, *Jesus Christ* as Man is under God's Law, but it were Blasphemy to say, The Law he is under hath such a *Sanction*. 'Tis evident, then, That a Law may Subsist without such a *Sanction*. And hence 'Tis plain, That when a *Sanction* is added to a Law, it must be understood so, as to agree unto the State and Circumstances of those who are under it. Now to Apply this, to our present Purpose. The *unrenewed Man*, I own, is under the *Sanction* of the *Curse*, and That, not only to be inflicted, but already, in part inflicted; but then, The very

State of Believers being *not to be under the Law, as a Covenant of Works, and so not under the Curse; but to be delivered from it, and under Grace, tho' they are never exeemed from the Law as a Perfect Rule of Righteousness, and from an Obligation unto Obedience thereunto; yet it comes not to them, cloathed with the Sanction of Eternal Death: For, Christ, hath Redeem'd them from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for them.*

The Absurdities, which the *Essayer* Enumerats P. 89. do arise from his fore-mentioned Mistakes about the True Nature of GUILT and PARDON, 'Tis plain, he does not Distinguish betwixt *that Guilt*, which may be called the very *Fault it self*, or the *Deed Done*, contrary to the Law, and *that Guilt*, which binds over unto Punishment by vertue of the *Sanction*, and *that Guilt* which consists in *Intrinsic Demerit*. This last he confounds with the *Actual Obligation* and *Lyableness* by vertue of the *Sanction*.

P. 90. He alledgeth *That if the Law be devested of its Sanction, and bring upon Believers only what some call Gospel-Guilt, Then, there's a large Score of Guilt for which Christ hath not satisfied.*

The *Advertent Reader* will easily perceive how our *Author* Mistakes this Matter. I Hope he will allow, That Christ was made a *Curse* for them, who were *Under the Curse of the Law*, and that Believers were by Nature under the *Curse* as well as others, and, That Christ hath delivered them from it. Now, if it was his Design to DELIVER their very Persons *From the Curse*, it could not miss to be his Design to KEEP them *from it*, when he had delivered them; And so, in a Way Consistent with their justified State, The *Curse*, with Respect to their *After-Sins*, is, as it were, *Intercepted*, which is no less a privilege, *than*

than the taking it off, when it had *Actually* fallen on them; seeing their Sins did *Deserve* it, and they would have fallen under it for them, if *The Application of Christ's Righteousness in Justification* had not prevented it.

The ESSAYER'S Reasonings about *Fear of Hell* and *Hope of Heaven*, P. 91. &c. Are a mere *confused Repetition*, which, I think not worth while to Trace. And his Way of representing a Minister's Preaching against the *Lyableness* of a Believer unto *Eternal Death*, shows how little he seems to have considered the *True Nature of the Gospel*. and proceeds upon this Mistake, as if true Believers; under the Perswasion of their *Freedom from Hell*, and even from *Lyableness* thereunto, would be of such a base Spirit as to take Liberty to Sin *because Grace Abounds*, and, as if their *Freedom* and *Privileges* did lead to *Licentiousness*. Nay, Mr. *Essayer*, it were easie to Represent your Way of Preaching, after the same Manner, upon the Doctrine which you grant, *viz. That Believers are secured from Hell as to the EVENT*; For, if you suppose, *That Fear of Hell* must be, the great Perswasive to move a Believer, even considering himself as such, in his Obedience; Might I not thus Represent your Preaching the Gospel, upon the Supposition of *The Believer's Security as to the Event*. "As for you, who are Believers, "Tho' you should break all the Commands "of the *First* and *Second Table*, tho' you had "Davids *Adultery* and *Murder*, Lot's *Drunkeness* "and *Incest*, &c. I must tell you, that all these "Sins will not bring you to Hell, for tho' you "are lyable unto it; Yet your *Repentance* is secured, "and the *Event* of Your *Eternal Salvation* too. Now, if such *Licentious Inferences* from the *Security* which the Believer hath as to the *Event* be absurd,

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 123
fard, they are no less SO, when drawn from the
Believer's State of Freedom from Lyableness unto Eternal
Death; For all the Edge of 'em must Terminate
upon the Fear they may have, with Respect to
the Event: And so the Force of our Author's fine
Speech returns upon himself, and, Only Discovers,
how little he seems to be truly acquainted with
the Gospel-state, Spirit, and Frame of a Believer,
and The Native Influence which their Privileges
and the knowledge of 'em should, and surely, in
some Measure, Will have upon them.

But, on the other Hand, let us see what a
fine Gospel-speech our Essayer must make upon his
Principles of the Believer's being Lyable to Eternal
Death for his Sins. " Q. D. Be it known to you
" O Believers, That tho' you be God's Children,
" yet you are lyable for your Sins, to be disinherited;
" tho' you are United unto Christ, yet you are ly-
" able to be cast into Hell; tho' you are Married
" unto Christ, yet, you are lyable to be Divorced
" from him for ever; Tho' you are clothed
" with his Righteousness, yet, your after Sins
" may divest you of that Robe; Tho' Christ was
" made a Curse for you to deliver you from the
" Curse, yet, your After-sins do bring you again
" under the Curse, for 'tis that Curse that makes
" you lyable to Eternal Death; Tho' Christ
" hath not only paid the Debt for you, but ap-
" ply'd his Righteousness to your Person, yet, you
" are lyable to be reached for that Debt, even
" by Vindictive Wrath. Tho' you be justified
" Persons, yet, you are lyable to Condemnation;
" Tho' the Sanction of the Law be fulfilled by the
" Surety for you, and that Surety-Righteousness ap-
" ply'd to you; Yet, your After-Sins bring you un-
" der that Sanction; Tho' Christ be in you the Hope
" of Glory, yet, you are lyable to be thrust into
" Hell for ever, Tho' the Event be secured that
" you

you shall not fall into Hell, yet you are no less lyable unto it than the *Elect* were before Conversion; Tho' you have got Thousands of Talents remitted to you, yet your new Sins bring you under *the same State*, you were in before any of 'em were Pardoned. Your *Justification* is no more perfect than your *Sanctification*; and therefore I exhort you to fear, That you may go to Hell, even tho' you should know you are brought unto a State of *Union with Christ*. These, are the sweet Cordials that our *Essayer's* Doctrine affords to Believers. And, if they will not admit of *These*, their belief of *Their* Freedom from all *this Lyableness*, will, certainly lead them (according to him) unto all Manner of Licentiousness. For, it seems, That Doctrine of *Freedom from Lyableness to Hell*, natively leads even the Believer, who is drawn by the *Cords of Love and Bonds of a Man*, to cast off all fear of God, all true and sincere concern for his Glory, all filial Obedience, all hatred of Sin as such, all concern to be Holy because He is Holy: All Regard unto the native Beauty of Gods Image. These are but a few of the *absurdities* which natively flow from our *Essayer's* Doctrine. Pray, Sir, Read the *sober Enquiry*, for a further View of this Subject.

I am not a little surprised to find our *Essayer* pretending P. 94. That our *Standard* is for the *Believer's Lyableness to Eternal Wrath*, and that it hath not *one Grue* of Gospel-guilt, but, that it looks on ALL Guilt as a *Lyableness to Eternal Wrath*. That it doth not use the Term *Gospel-guilt*: True: But, while it reckons, all that the Believer's Sins bring him under, to be *Fatherly Displeasure* and *want of the Light of God's Countenance*; I aver it maintains the *Thing* it self which others, for *Distinction's Cause*, have termed *Gospel-guilt*,
about

On GOSPEL and LEGAL PREACHING. 125
about the strict Propriety of which Phrase, I shall not contend. But our *Author*, when he Cites *Confess.* Chap. 11. § 5. Thinks fit to stop without mentioning THIS. And, as to what is Meant by *Continuing to Forgive* the Sins of those that are justified, it can't Import their being *Lyable* to *Eternal Death*; As the rest of the Paragraph in the *Confess.* (omitted by our *Author*) Evidently shows: But, with Respect to their *justified State*, whereby *Legal-guilt* is removed, it imports the Continuation of *That State*, without *Interruption* or *Intercision*, and so, makes against our *Essayer's Doctrine*, which can Import no less than a *Continual Interruption of that State upon the continual emergent of new Sins*. As also, *Continuing to Forgive*, hath a Relation unto the Removal of the *Obligation to Fatherly Displeasure*, which is *All the Obligation unto Punishment* that our *Confess.* ascribes unto Believers, in that very same *Article*. And, as to *Threatnings* applyed to Believers, no more is said in our *Standard*, but, that these *Shew, what N. B. their Sins do deserve*; and, this way of Speaking, plainly implys, That they are *not Lyable* unto what they *Really deserve*.

Our *Essayer* P. 95, comes to own, That his side of the Question, may be pressed with difficulties which can't be well got over. But Screens himself under the common pretence, That a true Doctrine is not to be rejected because of Difficulties. This indeed I own in General; But I affirm 'tis ill applyed in this Case to support a DANGEROUS ERROR. And, how poorly he grapples with the Difficulty, from the *Imputation of a perfect Righteousness to a Believer*, is Obvious, and his *Retortion* Ridiculous. For, 'tis certain, That God's looking on Believers as Righteous doth not Relate unto *Freedom from their Inherent Evils*, but
unt

unto *Their Freedom in Law*, upon account of the Imputation of the *Surety-Righteousness*: And in so far as God looks on them as cloathed with the Righteousness of their SURETY, he does not, in that Respect see Sins in them *i. e.* he does not see them under *Law-guilt* for any of their Sins. In that Respect, their Sins are *Covered and Blotted out and cast behind his Back*; But, this doth not, in the least, clash with his Sight of them, by the Eye of his *Omniscience*, and his being displeased with his own Children for them, as an *offended Father*.

His Quotation from Doctor Owen, P. 96. 97. Imports no more but the *Permanence* of the *Constitution* of the *Penalty*: Now, This is sufficiently maintained by considering, that Christ hath paid that Penalty. But then, he having done so, God is *just to Justifie them that Believe in Jesus*; And they can never be *Lyable to a Curse* which Christ hath delivered them from.

It would, Truly, make a Body Sick to rake into the *Puddle of Incoherent Notions*, which our Author Vents, P. 98. &c. in what he calls the *Rise of mistakes* about this Matter. And I shall not Trouble you with Remarks upon them, seeing a very little Reflection will discover how Trifling they are. *E. G.* Where is the Odds betwixt the *unconverted Elect* being *Lyable to Punishment*, but the Sentence not executed, and the *converted Elect* being also *Lyable* but will not be punished? I think the Phrases *not punished*, and *the Sentence not executed* are much the same. And this being granted in both Cases; His other Differences import nothing as to the Case of *Justification* which takes away *Guilt or Lyableness*, which is the present Question, and not what concerns *Sanctification*.

The

On GOSPEL *and* LEGAL PREACHING. 127

The Expression he quotes from the *Marrow 2d* Part Edit. 6th I own is *Harsh*, but Charity obliges me to think, That the *Publishers* of the *Edinburgh Edition*, had not the Sinister Views here insinuated, if it was designedly omitted: As also, That it will not bear all the Fearful Consequences drawn from it. However I shall not pretend to defend it, tho' I would fain hope, considering *That Authors General Scope*, That he meant no more but what our *Confess.* do express in much better chosen Words, Chap. XI. §. 5. And although, &c.

P. 105. &c. *To the End.* The Author Discourses upon *Gospel-preaching*, and the *Character* of a *Gospel-preacher*. I told you at the Beginning, I pretended not to attack *This whole Book*. I own what is truly *Valuable* and *Commendable*, and must say, my Soul was refreshed in Reading these following Pages. And, except some few Sentences which coincide with what hath, formerly, been Animadverted upon, I can chearfully agree to what Remains of his Book, and do think it Savours more of a Gospel Strain than, one would think, is Consistent with some of the *Errors* in the *Former Part*. And, were I to insist to Play the Critick upon it, it were no hard Task to make it Evident, That this *last Part* doeth in several Things Contradict and Confute the *Former*. But

I shall give but one Instance. P. 98. Tho' he Maintains, that Believers are, for their Sins, *Lyable* to Eternal Death; Yet he says, They have a *Right* to Heaven, which they will never make a *Forfeiture* of: But, P. 107. He makes a *Forfeiture* of all Claim and Title to Heaven, and a *Lyableness* to God's Wrath and Curse the very same Thing. And in that same Page says the
Be-

158. *A REVIEW of an ESSAY,*
 Believer's *Obligation* to Eternal Punishment is
dissolved, and his *Right* to the forfeited Happiness
Restored. Now if the *Forfeiture*, and the *Lyable-*
ness be the same Thing, as in P. 107, Then,
 either the Believer is not lyable to Eternal Death
 for his Sins, or, if he be, his *Lyableness* is his
 making Forfeiture of his Right, contrary to what
 he had asserted P. 98. I could give more Instances
 to this Purpose. But this is sufficient, and,
 I will Trouble you no further on this Subject,
 at this Time. I Hope you will Pardon Escapes;
 and I shall willingly Hearken to what may be
 offered for my Conviction. I shall be glad to
 keep up CORRESPONDENCE, upon *Edifying*
Subjects, and particularly, This of *Gospel* and
Legal Preaching, which, I apprehend, wants yet to
 be Cultivated, Tho' I could wish it were done
 more in a *Practical* than *Contraversial* Way. But
 Mean time I Conclude,



SIR,

Yours, &c.

POSTSCRIPT

The Author's distance from the *Press*, hath oc-
 casioned several *Literal Escapes* and wrong Point-
 ings. Which 'tis hop'd the Reader will easily
 perceive and amend. The most Material are
 These following.

Pag. 23. Line 22. *Dele* cf. P. 29. L. *Ult.* Course,
 R. Cause. P. 41. L. 4. *Truth*: R. Fruits. P.
 42. L. 4. Gift. R. Grips. P. 43. L. 6. his R.
 This P. 73. L. 29. unless. R. when. P. 89. L.
 9. That R. tho' P. 101. VALENTINUS R.
 VALENTINUS.

FINIS.

